THE
CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

No. CXXXII.] DECEMBER, 1855. [Vol. XI.

AGE AND ORIGIN OF THE PENTATEUCH.*

To those who have been accustomed to regard Judaism as having its root in the Pentateuch, and its successive growth and developement in the historical, devotional, didactic and prophetic books of the Old Testament, it is a somewhat violent inversion of thought to be told by modern German critics, that this same Pentateuch arose out of the gradually matured Judaism of priests and prophets, about, if not after, the time of the Babylonish exile, and that the monotheism of those priests and prophets was itself only the natural developement of the Jewish mind, and such as was common, in fact, to all ancient nations!

These are, in brief, the positions held in the learned book before us. The late origin of the Pentateuch is its express thesis; the purely human origin of the Jewish religion is its assumed and implied, though not argued, doctrine.

These two questions are easily separable, though they are thoroughly confounded with each other by the learned author on whose work we now presume to comment. If the literary proofs of the late origin of the Pentateuch, as a written composition, were clear and irrefragable (which we by no means admit), still the origin of that Judaism which existed in the earliest admitted historical period (say the time of David even), requires to be explained, and (we submit) is not explainable on merely human grounds; nor indeed is there any proper attempt at a philosophical explanation of its phenomena in these pages, while they quietly assume its merely human developement, and pooh-pooh the idea of a supernatural origin for its decidedly remarkable facts.

What are those facts? A small but singular nation stands conspicuous among the greater nations of the world for its acknowledgment of one sole and spiritual Deity, whom they think it profane to represent by any kind of image, and whom they worship with ceremonies which strikingly contrast with the superstitious grossnesses and cruelties of idolatry. To this sole Deity king David erects a tabernacle, and Solomon builds a costly

* Introduction to the Book of Genesis, with a Commentary on the Opening Portion. From the German of Dr. Peter Von Bohlen, late Professor of Oriental Languages and Literature in the University of Königsburg. Edited by James Heywood, Esq., M.P., F.R.S. 2 vols. Chapman. 1855.

temple, in Jerusalem. True it is that the Jewish people are not all proof against the gross fascinations of surrounding idolatry. True it is that when the kingdom is divided under Solomon's weak successor, the rival king of the northern tribes seizes upon the obvious, and mainly successful, policy of promoting local idolatry throughout his dominions, with a view of weaning his subjects from their attachment to the southern kingdom. But all this is perfectly natural on human principles of action, if we admit the specialty of Judaism as a divine revelation already proclaimed and instituted. This idolatrous tendency is not the less the "common sense of mankind" during those ages, and its promotion is, not the less, the obvious policy of Jeroboam and his successors on the throne of Israel. But, on the merely naturalistic principle, we are impelled to demand an explanation of that established monotheism which has reached so pure a height of philosophy, sentiment and morality, and dares to assume such a tone of authority. The monotheism of David* and his successors requires rational explanation. And if Samuel is appealed to as its founder (the favoured theory), we then require to be informed how Samuel obtained such a theology, and authority to accredit it to a nation of heathens, such as Von Bohlen declares the Jews long after his time to have been. For, whatever age of the Jewish history we contemplate, this monotheism was never the *esoteric* doctrine of the schools of philosophy, or schools of the prophets, but always a public doctrine and a popular belief and worship. How is it then, we necessarily ask, that a theory of religion and a practice of worship so unlike everything else in the contemporary world, had arisen in this one solitary little nation? One answer is—the common one—that the true God had revealed himself to Moses, and, before him, to the patriarchs of the Jewish nation, and had thus impressed upon them this very special national characteristic. Such a supposition (were it mere supposition) would account for all the unquestionable facts of the case; and, if the whole written history of the Jews before the time of David, or of Samuel, had perished, or the existing records were proved to be modern and fictitious, the great monotheistic facts which belong inextinguishably to the nation would still demand a solution such as is nowhere to be found in the mere *parallels* of history. A contrast so striking as that between a public monotheism ever denouncing the ever-besetting idolatry, and a public idolatry scarcely sheltering a timid philosophic school of monotheists, requires an adequate theory to explain it; and we have not yet seen any natural specialty pointed out as attaching to the Jewish people, that is capable of accounting for so strange a specialty of national character.

* "We can admit no conclusive proof of the worship of Jehovah anterior to the ancient hymns of David."—Von Bohlen, Vol. I. p. 150.

Supposing then, for argument's sake, the latest imagined authorship of the Pentateuch to be proved, we should still believe that the undoubted facts of later Jewish history, Jewish character and belief and worship, required a most special solution; and we should admit—with whatever allowance for tradition and myth and patriotic or priestly exaggeration the case might fairly seem to claim—that the Jewish theory of the origin of their own monotheism, as having been divinely promulgated by Moses after being their traditional belief for ages, and referred by them to primæval communications from the One Almighty to the patriarchs of their race, is the most simple and philosophical mode yet discovered of accounting for the unquestionable facts of the case.

This distinction then, we submit, ought not to have been lost sight of, or confounded rather, in a treatise designed to shew that the Pentateuch was not written till the later days of the Jewish monarchy. The arguments, whether conclusive or otherwise, which seemed to the learned author to bear out this opinion, did not further justify a chapter of purely conjectural history on the declared pre-historic times of Judaism, concluding with the following very broad and absolute statement, which the English editor has indeed thought it necessary to qualify by a parenthesis:

"Thus the historical developement of the religion of Hebrews is found to be parallel in every point [or rather in some important points] with that of other nations,—to be, in short, that of human nature itself." P. 155.

This kind of assertion is repeatedly made as the "voice of history," when by the author's own theory the matters referred to are pre-historical, and can therefore only be reached by inference. He quotes, indeed, various allusions from the Pentateuch and other books of the Jews, which admit and avow the fact of perpetual idolatrous tendencies; but he makes these writers to be "truster of their own report against themselves," in a way that would have astonished Moses and the prophets, as it does their intelligent readers in general. Professor Von Bohlen assumes the idolatry to have been original and national, and the monotheistic protest to have been occasional, gradual and unauthoritative, whereas the writers have uniformly said the very reverse. In the following passage, we know not whether to protest more strongly against the unlawfully wide inferences made from such avowals, or to wonder at the quiet assurance with which the commonplace Trinitarian argument from the plural form of the name *Elohim* is used by a scholar to prove that the Jews were mere heathens, with only the slightest passing allusion to the well-known grammatical usage of the Hebrew language, by which not only the name *God*, but Lord *(Adonim)* and Husband *(Baalim)*, are plural forms, as being representative (the grammarians tell us) of power or dignity.

"That the ancestral religion of the Israelites, like the general religion of the kindred tribes of Palestine, was a kind of rude polytheism, is admitted even by themselves, and this too in books which, if written in a more enlightened age, would surely have commenced with the stricter worship of Jehovah, had not the voice of history been so decidedly opposed to them. Household gods are mentioned even in the family of Abraham (Gen. xxxi.); the book of Joshua (xxiv. 14) expressly states that polytheism had prevailed among the people at an earlier period in Mesopotamia and in Egypt; and this polytheism, which down to the time of the captivity never intirely disappeared, may still be traced in the plural form given to the name of the Deity, *ĕlohim*. This has been admitted, not only by many of the rabbins, but also by Le Clerc, Gabler, Eichhorn, Herder and Ewald, and derives a striking confirmation from the fact, that in many cases, particularly when speaking of idolatry or holding intercourse with heathens, this name is employed with a plural verb and adjective,—a sufficient proof that it was originally understood to imply the plural number.* The supposition, therefore, that this form was merely employed as a plural of majesty, will not meet the difficulty."—P. 142.

And by the same "voice of (merest conjectural) history," the Jews are roundly designated a *nation of heathens!*

"But we must also remember the gross system of sacrifices in the worship of Jehovah himself, the soothsayers and magicians, the circumcision, the prophecies and the sacred decision by lot; and taking all these into consideration, we are constrained to admit that the Hebrews stood precisely on a level with the nations that surrounded them, and that we can only in a very limited sense speak of the monotheism even of the few poets and sages who from time to time appeared among the people. Nay, if a polytheistic people deserve in general to be designated as *heathens*, the Israelites are certainly well intitled to the name, more especially when compared with the ancient Persians, by whom all idols were held in abomination."—P. 162.

This is a specimen of the disposition of the learned writer to interpret everything in the Jewish Scriptures in *malam partem*, a system by which it would not be difficult to prove that the English nation itself is, in this 19th century, by the testimony of its own literature, a nation of drunkards, thieves, woman-killers, suicides, or even *heathens*. "The *gross* system of Hebrew sacrifices" could never be written with the fact fairly in view that those *purely ritual atonements* had been a continual protest against the heathen use of sacrifice as an atonement for *moral guilt*. The "soothsayers, magicians," &c., might exist in spite of discouragement from the Law, and need not be charged against it as an objection to its divinity. "The few poets and sages" who from time to time appeared as monotheists, adopted a very different policy from those of enlightened Greece, who feared

* The real question is not of its *original* or etymological import, but of its meaning in the minds of Abraham, the patriarchs and Moses, in reference to *their own* object or objects of worship. Of course it was also used by them, in reference to heathen gods, in its heathen sense, as the English is by us.

the vengeance of the prevalent polytheism and suppressed their monotheistic views in discreet privacy, whereas the former spoke plainly and authoritatively to the Hebrew "*heathen*" populace, as if anticipating a public response in the conscience, if not the affections, of their countrymen in general. And Persia is held up in invidious comparison with Palestine, as the true source of monotheism and free from the abominations of idolatry,—idolatry being superseded in Persia by a brighter visible god, the Sun, and by Fire as his sufficient visible emblem! Persia is afterwards, in a very inconsistent chapter (xv.) on the Babylonish Captivity and its consequences, made the source of the Jewish monotheism, and Zoroaster is the real Moses!

The same spirit of detraction and disposition to multiply difficulties and interpret everything amiss, is traceable, we regret to say, throughout these pages. Thus we are told (p. 31) there was not sufficient space in the ark for the ten commandments on stone (a statement which the English editor candidly gives us the means of disproving by a note of measurements). We seem to be given to understand (p. 88) that names of places, whenever significant, must be fictitious. The name Israel, we are told (p. 92), "could not have been adopted until after they were formed into a nation; and the book of Genesis, in consequence, endeavours to supply a more convenient derivation." We are assured (p. 152) that the name *Jehovah* was of foreign origin (but whence, we are not told), and that "the original motive for the sacred mystery" (which the Jews threw around the name) "was the fear that hostile priests might banish the national deity." Our author (p. 165) insists that the Jews offered human sacrifices, on the strength of the doubtful case of Jephthah's vow, the very special one of Abraham and Isaac, and the ever deprecatory allusions of the Hebrew books to the heathen practice of passing children through the fire to Moloch. He adopts the stupid assumption that Abel's sacrifice was accepted because it was an offering of blood (Vol. II. pp. 82, 84).* He assumes that "being cut off from among his people," meant capital execution (p. 171); and he explains the idea and the fact of the Sabbath by the seven known heavenly bodies of the solar system, and by the people being (he says) "partial to it as a kind of market-day."† And, in several places, in connection with the

* Yet he gives (through his English translators, John Edward Taylor, Esq., and another, not named except as a former schoolfellow of the editor) the following beautiful representation of the scriptural passage itself: "Why art thou wroth? And why dost thou bend thy face down towards the earth? If thou doest well, dost not thou look up? but if thou doest not well, then sin lieth before the door, and upon thee its desire is directed, but thou must rule over it."

How could any one translate thus, we wonder, and yet believe that the writer meant to represent Cain's offering as rejected *because it was not a bloody one?* But perversion and detraction seem the habitual medium of criticism in these pages.

† The only *proof* offered of this suggestion is most extraordinary indeed. In a note he says, "Compare the following verses:" and then quotes Isaiah i. 13,

attendance of women at the door of the tabernacle (whether, as Geddes thinks, as "ministering" by washing the feet of the priests, or as merely offering on one occasion their "mirrors" in aid of the construction or ornamenting of the molten laver), he insinuates gross ideas which should not gratuitously be attached to a married priesthood, when they are spoken of with indignation throughout the Hebrew Scriptures as the sin and disgrace of the ever-encroaching idolatry (see Exod. xxxviii. 8, 1 Sam. ii. 22, 2 Kings xxiii. 7).* All this and much more reminds one too closely of the style (which we had supposed obsolete, among scholars at least) of Paine's Age of Reason; an author whom we are surprised to find expressly classed by Von Bohlen among "laymen who have learned to view these various inquiries in their proper light; so that all unprejudiced interpreters are at present very well agreed in their estimate of the character of the Pentateuch" (see pp. 25, 26, and note).

The frequent exaggeration of biblical numbers (especially the number of the Israelitish people in the desert) is laboriously dwelt upon, just as if no modern critic had already frankly admitted it (see pp. 89, 102, &c.), when even in the popular history of the Jews by the English Dean Milman, it is pointed out as an error running through the Jewish records. And the book of Ruth is adduced as betraying intire ignorance of the *Levirate* law (p. 239), and as suggesting of course the inference that no such law was then known; whereas the case of Ruth shews the usage of marrying a relative's widow, as extended to *other kindred besides brothers,* to whom alone the law restricts the obligation. But these instances may suffice to sustain our charge of the *fas et nefas* style of argument against an author who does not scruple to speak of "Eichhorn's dogmatical assertions" as "only adduced in order to blind the inquirer" (p. 53).

The question of the composition of the Pentateuch is, as we have already hinted, quite separable from the intrinsic merits of Judaism and its claims to be considered a divine revelation. On the literary question, our author decides without any hesitation that the Pentateuch was of modern origin. History, he says, "has even enabled us to assign the very year of the first appearance of the Levitical code, viz. the 624th year before the birth

---

Hosea ii. 11, Amos viii. 5, in the last of which the people say, "When will the new moon be gone, that we may sell corn? and the sabbath, that we may set forth wheat," &c. This to prove that the sabbath was their market-day? (P. 218.)

* There is an infamous insinuation of a similar kind (pp. 46, 47) founding itself upon an etymological fact precisely analogous to that of the French curse, *sacre*, being derived from *sacer*, sacred; or of *sacer* itself in Latin, denoting sometimes the reverse of truly sacred, namely, "*devoted*:" according to which etymology, the French worship by cursing, and the Romans knew no difference between holy and filthy! It is, in fact, the attribute of what is unholy and immodest, to appropriate to itself, as if in mockery, the very names of holiness and modesty. And thus we at once explain the use of the Hebrew word in question.

of Christ" (p. 256). King Josiah reigned from 642 to 611, and in his eighteenth year the high-priest Hilkiah "found the book of the Law in the house of Jehovah." (See 2 Kings xxii.) Our author holds that this alleged discovery was the work of a "confederacy," including the high-priest Hilkiah and his son Jeremiah (the prophet), the prophetess Huldah, the scribe Shaphan and his son Ahikam, for the purpose of "possible deception" (p. 265). It was "the result of a well-considered scheme, designed to invigorate the nation by a new constitution, to unite the people more closely together, and to call forth a spirit of independence" (p. 268). It is not always quite clear, however, whether he takes Hilkiah's book of the Law to have been the whole Pentateuch, or only the book of Deuteronomy. "The whole external form and prevailing character of the language (he says, p. 50), are found to differ in no respect from those of the other writings of the Hebrews. The first four books in particular follow precisely in the self-same track with the purer productions of their literature; whilst the fragments of poetry, on the contrary, which are scattered through them, frequently vary so much in their tone and colouring, that they can no more be ascribed to the author of the rest of the work than the book of Deuteronomy itself, clearly stamped as it is with the forms and idioms of a far more recent date." This is ambiguous. "More recent date" *than what?* Than the other four books? or, than the fragments of poetry contained in them? We suppose the latter is meant. But (p. 45) our author presents a list of "words and forms from Genesis alone, which either follow the inflexions of the later dialects, or are only to be found in the books written *after the captivity*." Again (p. 46), he contrasts "Joel, for instance, and the older writers," with "the Pentateuch and other books after the time of the captivity." And again (p. 290), he speaks parenthetically of "the earlier appearance of Deuteronomy." Whence we conclude that he regards* Deuteronomy as the book of the Law written and issued by the "confederacy" in the year 624 B.C., and considers the first four books as the production of some pen subsequent to the return of the Jews from Babylon.

In protesting against this theory, we do not necessarily, nor in point of fact, hold that the five books were put together in their now existing condition by Moses himself. There are manifest additions since his time; and those who hold the essentially Mosaic origin of the books, may still admit all that reasonable criticism requires them to believe of the ravages of time and the confusion of recompilation, as wrought successively upon books whose framework they refer to so high an antiquity. All parties

* We cannot easily avoid speaking of an author as living on the first appearance of his book in our language; but Prof. Von Bohlen died in 1840, the work before us having been published in 1835. His "Ancient India" (1830) is his principal literary work besides.

alike must admit the traces of various original documents (of two most conspicuously) blended together in Genesis, if not in other books. All alike must consider the fragments of poetry as separable from the history, and must imagine the writer, at whatever period the Pentateuch was first compiled, to have embodied in his narrative not only the contents of more fragmentary histories, but also the rich oral materials of national and family tradition. On these questions, the internal evidence of the books themselves and our perception of intrinsic probability, must practically decide our view. We shall not, in our few remaining remarks, attempt to track the learned etymological arguments which rest upon Hebrew words and Hebrew style. The etymological proof attempted by the present author that Genesis is later than the captivity, proves quite too much to allow us to accept it as decisive. We shall derive our remarks from a larger and safer point of view, only repeating once more, that in maintaining a far earlier origin for the essential parts of the Pentateuch, we also believe it was inevitable that what Moses wrote or caused to be written in so early a period should undergo such changes, losses, alterations, additions, as may justify us in allowing all that criticism can clearly claim for later hands engaged upon it, down even to the time of Ezra.

Our first exception to the theory before us shall be on a matter of detail. We cannot understand how or why Deuteronomy should be composed *before* the other books. Supposing the other four to have been already known, we can realize the idea of Deuteronomy being produced as a supplement; just as we realize the thought, as matter of history, that Moses, having given the Law as detailed in the former books, might recapitulate and exhort "in the hearing of all Israel." And if Deuteronomy had been lost and was recovered in Josiah's reign, the history in the Kings is intelligible and natural. But, supposing no part of the Pentateuch to have existed in Josiah's reign, we think the high-priest and his confederates would, on the ordinary principles of pious forgery, have produced a history of the pretended giving of the Law, before preparing its supplement. The reverse plan, which is ascribed to them, seems to us too like putting the cart before the horse; or, in less homely phrase, it is a monstrous *Hysteron Protĕron*, which, though an excellent occasional figure in classical poetry and rhetoric, is neither good nor natural in history, nor probable, consequently, in historical forgeries.

Our next argument appeals to the structure of the books themselves. The parts relating to Moses and the delivery of the Law, have on them, we think, the indelible stamp of contemporaneous or nearly contemporaneous record. As an exposition of Judaism, the Pentateuch seems at first sight a book without system or order. Ritual, civil and moral laws alternate with precepts,

some temporary and casual, others fundamental and permanent, in strange disorder as regards subject. The one only thread of order that binds them together is that of the *journal* to which they are referred; and that thread is itself so tangled and broken as to require us to admit, in ascribing the original work to Moses or a contemporary, that time and chance must have worked sad ravages upon it. But can we believe that the alleged authors after the return from the captivity, were such skilful artists as to have invented, not merely the journal style of Moses, but also the dislocations and confusions of "devouring time"? To us, this seems impossible. Whatever has happened to the work since its original composition, that composition must, we feel convinced, be referred to the time of real journalizing, and could not have been first produced as we now see it, at a time when classification and codifying would have been incomparably more useful for the purpose alleged.

Another broad objection to the theory before us is the impossibility (in our view) that the alleged forgery should have gained credit, if no history of the giving of the Law was before believed to exist, and especially if the history was not even in its main points true. That such a history as is implied even in Deuteronomy was accepted by the nation with blind belief in the time of Josiah, surely implies a more thorough groundwork of historical fact than is admitted by this class of critics to pervade the Pentateuch. If they and their fathers had not only been "heathens" (with the exception of a few prophets and poets from David downwards), but had been so without reproof from any public and authoritative Monotheistic sentiment, how, in the nature of things, could they so quietly have admitted the new claims of the One God, when their fellow-heathens in Greece put Socrates to death for his very cautious dissent from their idolatry? This suggestion, we are of course aware (in conformity with the distinction which we took at the outset), goes to prove the earlier origin of the Mosaic Law and its earlier general recognition as a divine revelation, but not necessarily the earlier commission of it to writing. But the preservation of that mass of materials, so various and pointing to the very earliest periods of national history or tradition, seems to make it reasonable to suppose that these things were written down with the earliest use of writing among the Jews; an art which, with Egypt on the one hand and Phœnicia on the other, we see no difficulty in believing was possessed by them as early as the time of Moses.

In maintaining the essential antiquity of the Pentateuch, we have excused ourselves from attempting to track the maze of minute verbal criticism. But there are two critical considerations of a larger and therefore more reliable character, one of which especially seems to us decisive of a far earlier origin than that ascribed to these books by Von Bohlen. He is not, as we have

seen, self-consistent in his theory; but in Vol. I. p. 279, he expresses himself very positively in these terms,—that "the completion of the whole in its present form was the result of the Babylonish exile," is "the conclusion at which every unprejudiced inquirer must arrive."

The first question we have to ask is, how, on this supposition, the pure Hebrew style of the Pentateuch can be accounted for? Why is it not mixed with Chaldaisms, like the books of Daniel, Ezra and Jonah? We can understand, indeed, how, on the admission of a previously existing Hebrew literature containing the Law, the Histories, and the writings of the older prophets, those of the captivity and the return might (like Jeremiah, Zechariah and Malachi) adhere to the pure speech of their nation, while the historian Ezra adopted the then customary Chaldee, and the book of Jonah and the still later Daniel were written in Chaldee likewise. But that the Pentateuch, first making its appearance in the time and even under the hands of Ezra (for he surely is the presumptive author under that supposition, as he is made to be in the absurd Jewish legend in *Esdras)*, should be written in pure Hebrew, while Ezra's own history of his own times is in Chaldee, seems too improbable for critical belief.

Our second question rises above these matters of literary style to a great point of national belief. It is admitted on all hands that the Jewish belief in a future state clearly manifested itself immediately after the exile, and was scarcely traceable among the Jews before. Whether it was simply developed in them from their human desires and faculties as operated upon by a high theology and by the discipline of national trouble, or was imbibed by them from the Babylonians, we need not now decide. But we must ask, how is it, if the Pentateuch was the product of the exile, that this doctrine of a future state, which was the decided growth of that very period, never once shews itself in its pages? Bishop Warburton long ago proved clearly (in his *Divine Legation of Moses)* that the doctrine of a future state is not taught in the books professing to be the books of Moses. His argument from that fact does not now concern us; but the fact is certain. And are we now to believe that books artfully designed, and destined (as the result proved) to become the sacred Law of the Hebrews,—books addressed to their strongest religious and national feelings, and embodying all their acknowledged political, religious and moral institutions,—were written at a time when the nation possessed a decided belief in a future state, and yet that those books do not contain a trace of any such doctrine? The thing is impossible. A Pentateuch which had been "the result of the Babylonish exile," would, on Von Bohlen's own principles, have carried on its face the great doctrines of its age and country. This argument is to us decisive against his extreme view of the *late* origin of the Pentateuch; *how far back* it fairly carries us,

is another question, the proofs of which may be too shadowy for safe reliance.

In passing from the first volume, which consists of didactic chapters, to the second, which contains a translation, commentary and notes on the first eleven chapters of Genesis, we must content ourselves with one remark. Its purport is, to express our wonder that a critic who has so summarily disposed of the whole Pentateuch as a mere literary forgery of very modern date compared with its pretensions, and as thoroughly unhistorical and untrustworthy in all its contents,—that the same critic should devote further learning, and not a little taste, to its translation and illustration. We think we see in this the virtual recognition of a character as belonging to the book which the critic didactically denies. At least, he makes *us* feel, in various instances of improved translation and appropriate illustration, that those writings defy the rude touch he has elsewhere laid upon them, and command the truest reverence when all false literary pretensions on their behalf are freely laid aside. Such, for instance, is the old and still orthodox notion of plenary inspiration, and the resulting idea of seeking a scientific cosmogony and geology from Genesis; which, if not sufficiently confuted by the learned author, the English editor condemns with accumulated force. Mr. Heywood has personally contributed a chapter of additional observations on the venerable tradition of a Deluge, which he has enriched with quotations from Kenrick's Primæval History and Lyell's Geology. But can he really believe that the tree in Senegal (Vol. II. p. 194) is actually 5150 years old? And if this were admitted, could not a tree blest with such a constitution have survived a deluge of a few weeks? There are many stronger proofs adduced by the editor (to which we intirely subscribe) against the idea of a universal deluge.

BRITISH AND FOREIGN SCHOOL SOCIETY.

A few remarks seem due to the importance of the resolutions adopted by the late meeting at Birmingham on this subject.

That meeting was large, influential and eminently representative of the Unitarian body in all parts of the country.

With intire unanimity, and in terms of solemn and emphatic reprobation, the meeting denounced the present management of the British and Foreign School Society as a convicted breach of trust, on the evidence of its own Secretary, Mr. Dunn, and in accordance with the professional opinion of Messrs. Rolt and Jarvis, and the judgment, personal yet *quasi* judicial, of Lord Brougham, amongst a number of others of the oldest supporters of the Society. That Society, founded for the express purpose of promoting the education of the poor without distinction of

religious sect, has been gradually perverted to actively *orthodox* uses. Unitarians see in this perversion, not merely the exclusion of their members from the benefits of district schools thus conducted, and the denial of the advantages of the Training Institution to young men and women designed for teachers in their congregational schools, but, with a yet stronger, in proportion as it is a more generous, feeling, they regret and are determined to resist that tendency to *sectarianize* and "denominationalize" the education of the poor, which has marked the efforts of the last few years, in direct opposition to good Joseph Lancaster's idea of education for all, and for *all together*. It is his wide, catholic and truly national feeling, that chiefly urges the Unitarians to resist and redress a grievance which more pointedly insults their own church. To this extent we believe there was no diversity of feeling or opinion in the Birmingham meeting.

The diversity shewed itself as to the assumed *practicability* of realizing in the present day Joseph Lancaster's basis for a joint scriptural education of children of all sects. It was not doubted by any present that this basis had been consciously and deliberately abandoned. But it was doubted by some whether its restoration could be satisfactory to those who sympathize with the improved modes of education which have been realized since the days of Lancaster. Religionists of all classes consented, at that time, to have the Scriptures read without explanation (as was the case with many other reading books in schools), and this reading of the Scriptures (it is said) was thought to have a merit or a charm in itself. But now, we claim for all books read in schools that they be read *intelligently*, that the scholars be questioned upon their meaning, and that the master make the meaning plain to them. Hence, it is argued, the abuse complained of is only the natural result of having adopted a higher kind of school discipline, and the restoration of the old plan is not (it is said) worth contending for.

To this point, on which alone the meeting was not unanimous, we desire to address a few remarks.

And it ought not to be forgotten, in the first place, that Lancaster's own plan was not to read the Scriptures *indiscriminately*, without note or oral comment, but expressly to use *Selections* from the Scriptures suited to this purpose. We do not happen to possess Lancaster's own book of selections (apparently now obsolete); but we hold it to be perfectly practicable to form a very admirable book of Scriptural Lessons, which should need no comment in order to be at once intelligible and beneficial to children in schools. Nay, more; if the Scriptures are to be read in the day-school at all, we think such a book of extracts—biographical, moral and devotional, and not needing one word of comment or question—would be a far more desirable exercise for

children than that class of passages from which the British and Foreign School managers are at present accustomed to develope the orthodox mind of young theologians. There is, beyond a doubt, a broad basis of religion, morals and devotion, common to all Christians, and capable of being expressed in the unaided words of Scripture, which may be found, if the conductors of the British and Foreign School Society please to attempt the task.

Not that we, individually, think this the best basis for a day-school. In spite of the popular, but far from genuine and not always sincere cry, which rings high and low, in Parliament and the *Leeds Mercury*, for a *religious* day-school as a *sine qua non* (and which having been thus insisted upon, the admixture of religious sectarianism is next urged as demonstrating the impossibility of all sects joining and the injustice of the State assisting*), we do not hesitate to advocate the secular and moral day-school as the truly religious and manly solution of the educational difficulty. The purely secular day-school *is* in general use among the comfortable and wealthy classes, who send their children to the best master they can find, without regard to his religious sect, but under the express or implied understanding that doctrinal religion is no part of his province. This is reserved for home and Sundays. The case is different with a boarding-school, where the master takes the place also of the parent. We speak now of the mere day-school, and maintain that it is far better for good citizenship, for good morals, for kind feeling, and for ultimate religious culture too, to make the day-school secular and let children of all sects meet there, than to plot them daily, at an early age, into sectarian divisions. We repeat that this is the very course adopted by the rich and middle classes for their own children; but as soon as they charitably begin to provide day-schools for "the children of the poor," they mar their good by insisting upon inculcating their own religious peculiarities, which, according to their own practice, ought to be reserved for home and church influences. And if it is urged that the homes of "the poor" do not provide the requisite influences, the obvious reply is, that these same benevolent religionists are already making a special provision for their religious (doctrinal) training in their Sunday-schools. The doctrinal day-school looks too much as if its supporters cared more for proselytism than for education. And so "the poor" already suspect.

To return, then, to the British and Foreign School Society. If we could grant (which we do not) that the old Lancasterian

* At a late meeting of a Mechanics' Institution in Yorkshire, one of the speakers pithily described the *religious* obstructive as saying, "I object to any day-school teaching that does not include religion; then, of course, I should insist upon *my own* religion being taught; and of course people of *another religion* would not consent to this." Such, said the speaker, is this Gordian knot, which I defy any man to untie! The only chance is to cut it by the secular and moral day-school.

idea of reading Scripture extracts without comment was impracticable or unworthy of our higher educational ideas,—and maintaining, as we do (and as some gentlemen at Birmingham did), the superior wisdom of the secular day-school,—what is the legitimate conclusion to draw? That Unitarians should give the thing up as hopeless? Leave the abuse untouched? Quietly allow what they all consider bad in itself, namely, the indoctrination of young minds instead of the devotional and moral impression of young hearts by Scriptural reading,—and what they all unite in denouncing as immoral, namely, the perversion of a trust which expressly contemplated the latter use of the Scriptures, and not the former? This is indeed giving the opponent the benefit of a doubt! We know he is wrong and is violating the trust; we doubt whether it would be absolutely the best thing possible for education to make him observe the old trust literally; *therefore* we must let him pervert it still! Such reasoning we, at least, cannot understand. But we can understand that he must be forced at all events to revoke his wrong; and then, if the old Lancasterian basis be thought impracticable or undesirable, let those who think so insist upon substituting the secular basis as that which is most truly in harmony with the admitted design of the institution, namely, *schools for all.* If the Lancasterian basis be practically untenable, the Orthodox is morally so;—let the Secular be insisted upon as the now practicable mode of satisfying the essential conditions of the trust. We shall think it an improvement even upon Lancaster, if we may be allowed to have it; but let us first adhere to Lancaster, whether for his own sake or in hope of substituting a purely secular method. The present substitution of religious creeds is not to be permitted at any rate.

A doubt was expressed at Birmingham in this shape: If we should succeed, by extreme measures, in dispossessing the present managers of the British and Foreign School, we could not, with our small numbers, work that large trust beneficially to ourselves or the country. The Christian Reformer has never contemplated such *success;* nor do we suppose the Unitarians in general wish to have the management in their own hands. When Mr. Dunn is dismissed (as he must be, for he is "the head and front of the offending"), it is possible that a few persons of his narrow way of thinking may retire from the management. But we do a wrong to the various orthodox bodies in supposing that there are not multitudes of their best men ready to join us in working the Society on its legal and comprehensive principles, when once Parliament, or the Council of Education, or the Charity Commissioners—not to mention Chancery as the ultimatum—shall have spoken significantly on the subject. This is the kind of success which is plainly within our reach, and we must win it.

LOCKE'S WRITINGS AND PHILOSOPHY.*

It has been our good fortune, and we regard it as a privilege, to have been brought up to cherish great reverence for the memory of John Locke, not less as a patriot and theologian than as a philosopher. Our earliest recollections of metaphysical inquiry, of biblical and theological investigation, are mainly associated with the names of Locke, Priestley, Hartley and Price. However far the ripened judgment and enlarged experience of after years may have modified (as they have modified, to some extent) the views which we adopted under their guidance, we have never ceased to feel how much we are personally indebted to the influence of their works, not only for the mental discipline needful to pursue the study of intellectual and moral science, but likewise for many of the most powerful considerations by which our faith in the perfections and providence of God, and in the divine origin of the Christian religion, has been confirmed and established.

The Letters of John Locke concerning Toleration; his Treatise on the Reasonableness of Christianity as delivered in the Scriptures; the Essay for the Understanding of St. Paul's Epistles, with the Exposition and Notes, are the text-books to which we still habitually resort, ever with fresh pleasure and increasing profit; and we have always found it a positive relief to turn to the pages of the Essay concerning Human Understanding, after attempting, frequently in vain, to unravel the mystical speculations of the German school of philosophy. Having this experience and these sentiments,—shared in, we would fain believe, by a great many in our religious body,—we could not but hail with pleasure the appearance of a work devoted to the philosophical views of John Locke, and especially to the vindication of their character and tendency. Locke, in his own day, and his disciples after him, shared the fate of all those who, caring more for the progress of truth than for the applause of the world, have had the wisdom to think for themselves, and the courage to give their thoughts free utterance. Hard names,—sceptic, infidel, atheist,—were unsparingly applied to them and their principles. They cared little for this, knowing the spirit in which it originated, and the narrow theological exclusiveness with which it was associated. But we do think they would have cared if this had proceeded from other quarters; and they would have felt most deeply the imputation of scepticism and atheism, if it had come from the avowed upholders of freedom and charity. Under these circumstances, it is but natural that the disciple should feel called upon to vindicate the master, and endeavour to set

* Locke's Writings and Philosophy historically considered, and vindicated from the Charge of contributing to the Scepticism of Hume. By Edward Tagart, F.S.A., F.L.S. Longman. 1855.

forth his principles, and the tendency of them, in their true light.

It is mainly to this feeling in connection with the peculiar aspect of thought and opinion which has of late been manifested, that we are indebted for this work on Locke's Writings and Philosophy by Mr. Tagart.

"The work," to quote the author's own words in the Preface, "consists of two parts. The first is a vindication of Locke from prevalent misrepresentations, and especially from the charge of encouraging scepticism in religion and morals, shewing by a somewhat careful examination of Hume's metaphysical writings, that Hume neither built nor affected to build on any principles peculiar to Locke, and placing Locke in just relation to Descartes, Berkley, Gassendi and Leibnitz. The second contains a view of the progress of English philosophy, properly so called, from Bacon, through Hobbes, Locke and Hartley, to modern thinkers, such as Bentham, Mill and Austin."

Having shewn, by quotations from the writings of Dugald Stewart, V. Cousin, C. Rémusat and Mr. J. D. Morell, that modern opinions concerning Locke demand a vindication, the author enters upon a special examination of the charge brought against Locke by the Scotch philosopher, Reid,—that Hume, on the principles of Locke, had built a system of scepticism which leaves no ground to believe any one thing more than another; and that Berkley, following the same principles, "frighted at the appearance of the dreadful abyss, starts aside and avoids it." This accusation is met, as regards Berkley, by specific animadversions upon Locke's principles in the Bishop's own works (in which Mr. Tagart would appear fully to concur), and by several incidental differences between Berkley's principles and those of Locke. These, with the absence of any pretence elsewhere on Berkley's part to build his theory of the non-existence of matter upon any principles or concessions which were peculiar to Locke, constitute the reply to the misrepresentations of Reid.

But how the matter stood in respect to Hume, the author himself admits, "is a more tender question." Appeal is first made to his life and correspondence. This is followed by an elaborate analysis of some of the more prominent features of his sceptical philosophy as they present themselves in the "Treatise of Human Nature" and in the Essays. As might be expected, especial attention is paid to the question of the "origin of our idea of power," as the point on which the whole of Hume's sceptical philosophy turns. The result at which the author arrives by this investigation is, that while the "Treatise on Human Nature" is full of sentiments and language which it could not have contained but for the impulse and direction which Locke's Essay had given to metaphysical inquiry, yet that Locke did not supply Hume and the French sceptics with any of the peculiar elements of their

dogmatic scepticism; but, on the other hand, he did supply to Bentley, Law, Butler, Paley and Hartley, some of the elements or arguments for their benevolent religious faith. (P. 114.)

The limits to which this notice is necessarily restricted, do not admit of our entering on the specific grounds upon which this conclusiou is founded. While we are not prepared dogmatically to pronounce them all satisfactory, we nevertheless consider them deserving of the careful consideration of the student. We cannot but think that the author's design would have been much more effectually carried out by the omission of a great part of the collateral discussions, literary and metaphysical, dispersed through the work. Though interesting in themselves, and often well conducted, they seriously interfere with the clearness and force of the vindication specially undertaken. We also regret that the opinions and sentiments advanced, while fearlessly expressed, are not so free from the influence of strong feeling, and perhaps prejudice, as might be desired in a work of this character. The author's dislike of the Scotch philosophy appears to extend even to the philosophers themselves. What he says of the "Wise Club" (p. 25) is, we submit, neither wise nor prudent. To impute motives is always to tread on dangerous ground, especially when we professedly have nothing else than *probability* to rest on. Those who have devoted much thought to metaphysical study, but still do not regard the defence of Locke's first book on Innate Ideas as convincing, are not likely to think more favourably of the considerations by which it is defended when they are told that "they are either misunderstood or are *purposely disregarded*" by them. (P. 232.) Our own decided bias in favour of the views generally advanced by the author, make us the more to regret the occurrence of expressions and sentiments calculated to irritate and offend those who hold opposite views. The strife of metaphysicians is often a strife of words; and it would be well for both parties to consider whether (as Locke himself suggests), "if the imperfections of language as an instrument of knowledge were more thoroughly weighed, a great many of the controversies that make such a noise in the world would not of themselves cease, and the way of knowledge, and perhaps peace too, lie a great deal opener than it does."

The second part of the work, while it contains much that is interesting in reference to some of the leading principles of Locke's system, as unfolded in the Essay, includes likewise a pleasing notice of the other literary and religious productions, as well as the patriotic and philanthropic labours, of the philosopher. When we remember that the four last years of his life were employed in the calm and diligent study of the Scriptures, and while we have the result of that study in his Paraphrase and Notes to the Epistles, we need no other refutation of the inconsiderate and unfounded accusations brought against Locke. It is utterly

inconceivable how Professor Schlosser, for example, could assert that Locke "rejected the proof (of Christianity as a divine revelation) which rests upon miracles and supernatural operations,"* while the "Treatise on the Reasonableness of Christianity," with the succeeding Vindications and Replies, abound with the most explicit and unqualified acknowledgments of the miraculous and supernatural in the life of Christ. In this case, charity requires that we should conclude that the historian had not himself read the works he professes to criticise; and prudence requires, not less emphatically, that we should accept with great caution whatever may proceed from sources so manifestly untrustworthy. The only safe course is to go to the fountain-head, and to learn from the writers themselves what their principles are and the grounds on which they rest. At the same time, such works as that under consideration are of great service; and this work in particular, we believe, may be consulted with profit by those who are disposed to adopt this course in reference to Locke and his philosophy.

We sympathize most fully with the sentiments expressed in the following extract, with which we close the notice of Mr. Tagart's book:

"As the last chapters, on the imperfection and abuse of words, and the remedies thereof, constitute the most valuable part of the third book, so the later chapters of the fourth book of the Essay, on the existence of a Deity, the improvement of knowledge, the nature and degrees of assent and error, on faith and reason, and the division of the sciences, deserve the deepest attention. No writings in the English language breathe a purer and loftier spirit, or tend more powerfully to form the candid, philosophical, religious mind. It is not only that high ethical character to which Mr. Hallam does full justice, that freedom from the spirit of party and absence of partiality even to his own opinions, apart from the evidence which facts and reasonings furnish, but what is more, because so rare in the philosopher, a constant remembrance of the relation between the human finite intellect and the infinite unknown; that modest sense of human ignorance and error, combined with an anxiety to turn to good account whatever can be known with any approach to certainty; and, above all, that disposition to find the final cause of everything in the wisdom and benevolence of the Creator; these are the moral graces that shed their halo round the memory of the illustrious Locke, and make his Essay on the Human Understanding at the same time a work well fitted to purify and enlarge the heart. Should any taste for genuine English thought and literature survive the present race of thinkers, should it again be reckoned among the needful accomplishments of an English gentleman to know well the greatest and best authors of his country, the estimation of Locke will rise once more to its just height, and the candid youth of universities and halls will be taught to pronounce with veneration the name of the most philosophical of Christians, the most Christian of philosophers."—P. 423.

A.

* History of the Eighteenth Century, by F. C. Schlosser, Vol. I. p. 28.

THOUGHTS ON SECULAR ATHEISM.*

Chapter II.

THE QUESTION TO BE ARGUED.

How came this wondrous universe and its laws to be what they are? is a question as old as human thought and deepening with the progress of human knowledge, which has shewn us more and more wonders continually. A question more easily put than definitely answered;—perhaps never to be minutely and positively answered.

But some approach to an answer the mind insists upon finding. A general, if not a particular, solution we must have;—a proximate, if not an exact one. The necessities of human thought require it, as shewn alike by the Theistical and the Atheistical theories. We do not expect mathematical demonstration, as the subject does not admit of it. But we desire moral certainty, if that be attainable; or, short of that, we desire moral probability, in whatever degree it may be had.

Is the Universe, or the World, or Nature (as variously called by these several names), with its existing order and laws and powers, an ultimate fact upon which the mind can or ought to repose, without seeking some other Cause or Causes to account for its present constitution?

Is the Universe, or the World, or Nature, with its observed powers and laws, self-existent (self-caused, we will not even ask); is it self-governing by its own conscious and reasoning Will;—a Law to itself?

Or is it self-developed from some previous state by inherent Reason, Activity and Will?

Human reason, with very general consent, has said No, to all these suggestions. Men in all ages have regarded its existing phenomena as effects pointing to causes however obscure. But to trace them back to a First Cause has been the perpetual difficulty, since each of the observable causes is plainly nothing but an effect still referring us for its own causation to something further back continually.

The existing tribes of men and animals are traceable back to progenitors more and more remote, but no more capable of self-origination, in accordance with the known existing laws of animal life. But this perpetual series of dependent results cannot satisfy us. "Adam's ancestors without an end" still require an ancestry, or else—an origination. Had the series then a beginning, before which such life was not? This is our question.

The earth's history, laid open by the geologist, can be traced back through ages of gradual change under the action of the same great laws and forces which now prevail. But was there

* Continued from p. 681.

not a period when those laws themselves were first enacted, or those forces called into operation? Or, if we say, No—if we can conceive, No—are those Laws the ultimate facts in our belief? Are they to be regarded as having exerted the originating will? Are they to be received as self-existent powers? Do we rest satisfied with them,—or need something different, with them, above them, prior to them? This is our question.

The solar system obeys the great Law of Gravitation. Its very perturbations are referable to the law which they seemed at first to defy. Was Gravitation then the primary Cause of the existing order of the solar system? Is it a conscious Cause, aware of the wondrous harmony which it produces and desiring to produce it? Is Gravitation a self-existing Cause, an efficient Will? Or is it an efficient cause indeed, but not the Primary one?—a cause that needs a yet higher Cause to account for it? This is our question.

Human thought has always been confounded in its attempts to imagine the beginning of things. And to imagine them without a beginning equally baffles human thought. But it is felt that merely material causes cannot be accepted as the ultimate explanation. It is felt that the question is a question of Mind as well as of Matter. Thought, design, will, make part of the phenomena. And then the mutual relations of a presumed forming Mind and an assumed passive Matter, present new difficulties to the speculative cosmogonist if he attempts to realize the formative process to his thought. Was Mind eternal, self-existent, uncaused? Did Deity exist before Matter was formed? Was Matter formed out of nothing? Hard questions these, the very meaning of which we scarcely realize in distinct thought; how can we then hope for distinct answers? But the mind that is familiar with the properties of Matter, can hardly conceive of such a thing as the formation of Matter out of mere nonentity, and hesitates to pronounce that it was so formed. Was Matter, then, eternal too? And did Mind impress order and law upon it? Was not Matter, then, self-existent, and in some sense divine as well as Mind? This is the perpetual perplexity with every one who attempts to decide how the universe began. The old Greeks felt the difficulty, and tried in vain to solve it. Some of their philosophers satisfied themselves with theories which cannot satisfy us; such as this: That Mind formed all the varieties of Matter out of Water. The difficulty is only clouded, not solved. The mind persists in asking how the Water came to be, and how that one sort of Matter could be made into all other kinds. Some of the old Greek sages gave Matter such properties as almost to deify it. Others extended the phenomena of Mind so as almost to preclude the existence of Matter. And modern philosophy has had (perhaps still has) both these phases; the Materialist endeavouring to regard Mind but as a phenome-

non of Matter, the Berkleyan explaining all material objects as phenomena of Mind.

Perhaps, notwithstanding all the metaphysical acuteness brought to these inquiries, we must be content to be ignorant of the process by which, or the steps through which, the universe itself, or even its present order, originated. Perhaps we cannot hope to decide whether matter was created from nothing, or merely transformed and impressed with its now-existing laws, by the will of the Supreme Mind. It is wonderful that these questions should ever be deemed the essential preliminaries to an argument for a ruling God! Questions more immediately relevant are less abstruse by far. We *can* define the leading attributes of Mind by our own consciousness, and decide that the material universe and its phenomena bear unmistakeable signs of a presiding Mind. We *are able* to distinguish between mental and material phenomena. We *can* say, the material phenomena, however far traced back, still require the intervention of Mind to explain them. And if we discover the clear impress of Mind upon the works of the material universe (not to include, just now, any reference to its more direct impress upon subordinate and created minds), this is the required recognition of Deity. That the universe bespeaks a Mind is the confession of Theism. We may find God in Nature without having attained a dogmatic theory as to when or how matter was made, or whether *made* (in the metaphysical sense) at all. If, in short, the universe and its laws can be satisfactorily accepted as an ultimate fact without the recognition of Mind in them, then is Atheism the wise man's conclusion. But if the recognition of Mind in connection with these phenomena is necessary to meet the real facts of the case, then Theism is the true conclusion in the eye of reason, though the Theist may still be unable, and is not indeed required, to explain *how* that Great Mind of the universe is self-existent, or *how* the Matter of the universe came into existence. On the supposition of Matter alone, we have no sufficient originating cause; and so we necessarily come to a stop as soon as we are tired of repeating the same endless series of passive antecedents and consequents. On the supposition of Eternal Mind, we have a true Cause in action, an originating Will, a self-moving Power, though we may not know at what period of boundless duration to introduce its first or its progressive agency.

The question for us, then, is not, How or when the universe originated; but this—Is it more rational to ascribe its vast and wonderful phenomena to an Eternal Mind capable of comprehending and ordaining its laws,—or to eternal Laws requiring (according to the very notion of a law) an ordaining Mind, but no such Mind being supposed? The question is not, Was Matter eternal? or, Was it formed out of nothing? We may leave these questions still for such as dare hope to solve them. What we

desire to settle is this question: Can the supposition of eternal Matter, destitute of Mind, Will, Motive, account for a universe such as this? or is a designing and forming Mind essential to a satisfactory explanation of the phenomena, whether Matter be deemed eternal or not? We are not in search of a cosmogony, but of a religion. That there is a Being, all-powerful, wise and good, by whom everything exists, is what the devout Theist desires to see reasonable evidence for believing. If he find reasonable evidence of this, he may be satisfied to leave the question of the eternity of Matter still unsolved. Matter is—whether eternal or not. And Mind is. Surely that Mind which is traced in the laws of Nature is supreme, if not antecedent also;—not emanating from brute Matter, but giving to it life and perception, beauty and happiness. Surely the Mind that is manifested in the universe is its ruling principle, the fountain-head of its laws. That is the Theist's proposition, divested, as it ought to be but seldom is, of all needless yet (in their place) curious and natural speculations respecting the origin of Matter.

Chapter III.

THE KIND OF ARGUMENT APPLICABLE.

The proof of the existence of Deity has been attempted by two different processes of argument; the *a priori* method, and that *a posteriori*. By the former, it is attempted to shew, from abstract metaphysical reasoning, on the datum of an existing universe, but without reference to its actual phenomena or laws, that it is impossible rationally to conceive of the non-existence of an intelligent Mind in any period of past duration,—that a Divine Mind must always have existed because things and beings not divine exist now. This was the mode of argument adopted by the celebrated Dr. Samuel Clarke, of Westminster, in his Boyleian Lectures of 1704, in dealing with the systems of Spinoza and Hobbes. Beginning with self-evident propositions, he endeavoured, with great acuteness of reasoning, to prove the necessity of believing in a self-existent and supreme Mind. But this mode of argument is not, at any rate, the most suitable for reasoners in general; and an interesting anecdote is told by Whiston, in his Memoir of Dr. Clarke, shewing the comparative availableness of the two modes of reasoning. Clarke (then *Mr.* Clarke) brought his friend Whiston his book when the latter was in his garden. Perceiving that he had dealt much in abstract metaphysical reasonings, Whiston asked him how he dared venture upon such subjects, and shewing him a weed in his garden, said, that that weed contained better arguments than all his subtleties. To which Clarke replied, that as Hobbes and such men had used abstract argument against religion, he thought the same kind of reasoning was useful in its defence. Except under such a special

plea, the *a priori* argument can hardly find favour. The argument *a posteriori*, or that which rises from perceived effects to their inferred causes, is the more intelligible mode of investigation, and indeed the more philosophical too; for the attempted *a priori* mode tacitly assumes the existence of a universe, though without setting forth its particular phenomena. The problem, of which every thoughtful mind feels it necessary to attempt the solution, is this: The universe, and especially that part with which man is most intimately concerned and best acquainted, being such as it is,—how to account for these phenomena. And the general method of the inductive philosophy, now universally adopted in scientific inquiries, is applicable here as everywhere else. We collect, classify and estimate the existing effects. We inquire into their causes. We ask whether those causes themselves, when found, are primary or only instrumental. So long as we find them merely material, we feel that we have not reached a primary cause. When we have inferred a presiding Mind and Will, we have grasped the idea of God, and, with it, of a Cause supreme, on which the mind can dwell, however vaguely, yet without self-contradiction. This, then, is the rich field of inquiry and speculation ever open to the thoughtful mind:—the world, the universe, and all that it contains; its laws and properties; its phenomena; its living creatures; man himself, the inquirer and the chief part of the phenomena;—what signs do all these things exhibit of a Supreme Mind? What attributes do these things bid us ascribe to such a Mind? What kind of Creator is mirrored in the works of Nature?

There is another kind of argument (if indeed it is not resolvable into the first mentioned) sometimes attempted on this subject, and relied upon by some metaphysicians in proof of the existence of a Supreme Being, namely, Intuition. They say the belief in a God is intuitive, a necessary belief of the human mind. They class it, in this respect, with the belief in one's own existence, the belief in an external world, and other beliefs (variously enumerated) which they deem incapable of being referred to other mental laws, and therefore accept as primary and necessary. But the Atheistical controversy is, at any rate, an inappropriate place for this argument; if, indeed, the existence of such a controversy ought not to be admitted as disproof of the alleged intuition. The avowed Atheist denies that he has any intuition proving the existence of a Supreme Mind. It is pure absurdity to appeal to any such intuition, in argument with him at least.

We therefore rest on the simplest and most intelligible, while most copious argument, from the known facts of the world and human life, to the primary Cause of those effects. This is the abiding and all-pervading source of thought upon the subject,—the source both of conviction and of difficulty. The wonder,

the greatness, the beauty, the bounty of creation, are the constant arguments for the Divine existence, power, wisdom, goodness; while the evils of the world are the source of all our difficulties and objections.

The argument has been chiefly confined, by writers on Natural Theology, to the physical phenomena of the universe, and especially to its mechanical laws. Paley's treatise on "Natural Theology" is chiefly occupied in illustrating design from the mechanical contrivances (so to call them) observable in plants, animals and in the human frame. These, with one chapter on the Elements and one on Astronomy, form his illustrations. In giving this prominence to mechanical arrangements, the author followed the bent of his own genius. But the reader is not restrained from seeking other illustrations more suited to his own special taste in any other parts of the wide realm of science. Paley did an admirable work, and did it admirably, though it may not be considered a complete one. Who, indeed, shall produce a *complete* description of all the instances of power, wisdom and goodness, that the universe contains? But it is probable that Paley's argument has been somewhat misunderstood by those who have disparaged it. Some have revolted from its mechanical illustrations; and it has even been said to suggest Atheistical doubts, instead of precluding them, by the minute way in which it adduces instances of mechanical contrivance. Of course the essence of Paley's argument is to trace *analogy*, not *identity*. It is, that if certain qualities seen characterizing a human work, are admitted to betoken the voluntary adaptation of means to ends; and if, the ends being good and the means cleverly adapted, the first artist is rightly inferred to have been good and clever; then, on the principle of analogy, similar and greater marks of good and wise design in the works of Nature must be admitted as proofs of mental and moral attributes of the same kind, proportionately higher, in the Author of Nature. This is the sum and substance of the argument throughout. But if any reader chooses to run the analogy so close as to imagine the Creator deliberating, contriving and experimenting, like a human artist gradually working out his design (not a word nor thought of which is there in Paley), he is coarsely misrepresenting the subject to his own thought. We may speak of the Divine "Architect," or even of the Divine "Mechanist," figuratively, and with reverence and real elevation of thought; or we may degrade the thought by our way of conceiving and expressing it.

These and similar illustrations from the works of the creation, with which books of Natural Theology abound, have left comparatively untouched the Natural Theology of *Man* himself. Or, so far as they have had reference to man, it has been chiefly to his bodily frame, not to his spiritual powers, capacities and aspirations; nor to the perplexities, difficulties and evils dis-

closed in human life and the human soul. Yet, all the while, Man himself and human life are the great problem for solution. The pressing difficulties are here; and the conscious argument, too, is deepest and highest here. Man is the head of creation in the sphere to which he belongs. There is nothing so great, so wonderful, or so precious, as his mental and moral nature. All other things, all other beings, are subject to him. It is the fact of all ages, which the Scriptures have but clothed in words, that he is lord, that he is the image and representative of God to all other beings, which are subjected to his will and devoted to his use and service. Man is himself the Problem and the Reasoner, a difficulty at once and an advantage in the inquiry. His own consciousness and experience can supply abundant facts, if his self-love can look at them impartially.

We shall look at the argument chiefly from this point of view, as connected with the human condition, faculties and prospects; not forgetting the claims of other orders of creation (in regard to which, indeed, the question of Providence is more simple and easy by far), but making that to be prominent in the argument which really is so (consciously or unconsciously) in the mind's reasonings and feelings respecting the great question of the Being and Attributes of God.

GERMAN TRANSLATION OF THE WORKS OF DR. CHANNING.*

It may not be uninteresting to our readers to be informed that in the course of the present year there has been completed a German translation of the Works of Channing. It has been executed by two men in every way competent to the task,—F. A. Schultze, Schulrath or Government Inspector of Schools, and Ad. Sydow, a preacher of eminence in Berlin, known, we believe, to some of our friends in this country, which he visited some dozen years ago. The translation, commenced in 1847, is in fifteen small volumes, contains all the published works except a few tracts on American politics, and is executed with that accuracy and fidelity which, seconded by the peculiar advantages of the language, have made German translations all but equal to the originals. It is accompanied with literary notices on the Life and Works, from which we make two short extracts, which will shew the estimate formed of Channing by the learned and philosophical thinkers of Germany. The first is from a prefatory notice by A. W. Zumpt.

---

* Dr. W. E. Channing's Werke. In einer Auswahl aus dem Englischen übersetzt. Von F. A. Schultze und Ad. Sydow. Berlin und Leipsig—Hermann Schultze. 1850—1855.

"We have endeavoured to describe the literary activity and influence of Channing in its varied bearings, but we doubt whether we have conveyed an adequate idea of his peculiar excellence and power. There is probably no reader who would not feel this power, and few who would not be involuntarily carried away by it to reverence and enthusiasm. What is it then in Channing that exercises this almost magic power? Not his Unitarianism, for that finds more opponents than friends; not the brilliance of his style, not the acuteness of his intellect, nor the freedom of his utterance, nor even the purity and clearness of his thoughts. It is this, that he inspires us with reverence for our own nature; teaches that we were created for, and may attain to, the highest destiny; that every human being has the germ of this within him, and it requires only his own active will to bring it to maturity. This divine germ that lies in every human soul is the great and constant theme of Channing's eloquence. Whether repressed and choked by narrow creeds, or trampled down by a brutal despotism, or chilled by want and poverty, or crushed by the slavery to which an unhappy race has been unrighteously condemned, this always finds in Channing a warm and untiring advocate. It is this which has procured and will procure him enthusiastic admirers wherever there are hearts sensible to human happiness and progress."

Our second extract is from the concluding remarks of the editors.

"Our object in translating Channing's writings has been to make our country acquainted with a man of eminent moral greatness, who exercised the happiest influence on a great portion of the Anglo-Saxon race; and rather to present for admiration and imitation his lofty, pure and Christian spirit, than to recommend his special views in politics and theology. As the former find their explanation and justification in the political and social relations of the United States, so the latter will not fail to display to the theologians of Germany many a scientific weakness, due to the unfamiliarity of the writer with the development of critical theology among us. In spite of this, however, the reader of these works will often be surprised by the remarkable coincidence which the views of Channing, springing from a deep moral and practical realization of Christianity, present with that theological science which with us has been the result of a logical and metaphysical development. As Channing's love of Truth demanded in everything reality, inward and outward, and as the Spirit, moral, Christ-like and holy, was to him the highest and sole reality in heaven and on earth, so also doctrinal truths and articles had value and truth for him only so far as they were an emanation from this holy, Christ-like spirit, and seemed conducive or necessary to its existence. This was to him the test and proof of truth, and he would, we believe, have forthwith given up any dogma, provided only he were convinced that it was unnecessary or unfavourable to the growth of the Christian life and spirit. His faith in the supernatural rested, therefore, upon a basis perfectly rational indeed, but moral and practical rather than metaphysical or logical. This observation, which will force itself on every reader, gives, in our opinion, the only true standard for estimating his doctrinal views, and will conciliate for them the respect even of those who, regarding them from a different point of

view, may think them mistaken and untenable. Be this as it may, the noble and lofty spirit of Christian purity and love to men which beams forth in every page of Channing with peculiar power and beauty, will assuredly win a way to every truth-loving reader's soul, and awaken in him similar emotions and resolves."

FIRST EPISTLE OF CLEMENT OF ROME TO THE CORINTHIANS.

[The able organ of the Liberal French Protestants, *Le Lien*, has recently published a series of papers entitled, Theological Talk. That which we now present to our readers in an English dress is the sixth of this series, and is from the pen of M. Réville.—Ed. C.R.]

In our last talk, we endeavoured to give our readers a specimen of the controversies of which the Church was the theatre after the death of the apostles. The Epistle of the pseudo-Barnabas, penned towards the close of the apostolic age, inspired with a passionate hostility to Judaism, has supplied them with proof of the fact, that at this epoch the Church was not exactly the ideal society—water unruffled by a single wave—a sky without a cloud—which it has since been described. At the same time, the opportunity has been given them of realizing the extent of that variety of opinion which agitated the Christian body during the life of the apostles; for the question discussed about the year 95, is precisely the same as was discussed at Jerusalem, at Antioch, in Galatia, at Ephesus, at Corinth and at Rome, in the time of Peter and of Paul,—Is it necessary, in order to be a Christian, to bind oneself to the observance of the Law?

To be a Christian, we say. For let us not forget that, from the beginning and on both sides, there is perfect agreement on this point, that Jesus of Nazareth is the author of salvation; and it is this pre-eminence of *Christian* interest, considered as superior to all others, and as specially distinct from the Judaic or Pauline interest, which will very gently bring about the fusion of parties, or, to speak more correctly, their disappearance. It is this which animates that primitive conciliatory party amongst which we have shewn that Peter from the first took his rank. It is an *ecclesiastical* party, whose instincts and tendencies are liberal, but whose practice, through a spirit of compliance and by the necessity of their position, is often Judaic-Christian. It is on this point that we deliberately separate ourselves from the school of Tubingen, who, we think, has greatly exaggerated the differences which separated the point of view taken by Paul from that taken by the twelve. This school has the merit of having recovered the key to the history of the primitive Church, by resorting to the antithesis, previously a little too much forgotten, of the Pauline Christianity and the Judaic Christianity. But some one will say that an Hegelian prejudice has prevented the

admission that the synthesis, at least as respects tendency and desire, may be subjectively conceivable, before that the antithesis ought to be objectively affirmed and entirely developed.

The primitive Church did not learn logic at Berlin. To every one slightly acquainted with human nature and history, two branches of knowledge closely connected together, it is an *a priori* probability that wherever two principles exist together, especially where one lies to the right and the other to the left, that there is also a centre, a neutral ground, inclining to conciliation. It is *a posteriori* certain, from the history of the New Testament, that Peter was a representative of this intermediate tendency. We cannot absolutely recognize in him the man whom received tradition presents to us adhering in every conjuncture to the very same principles as Paul in apostolic theories and conduct, and only once accidentally disavowing at Antioch certain convictions which he had always and everywhere proclaimed. For on such a theory the history of the primitive Church would be nothing else than an inextricable labyrinth, and the numerous Judaic Christians of the two first centuries would have been victims of a remarkable aberration in making his name their rallying-point and himself their favourite apostle. On the other hand, the testimony of Paul in the Epistle to the Galatians is an unanswerable proof that Peter was not an Ebionite.

A conciliatory party, animated throughout with practical views, has, then, existed from the beginning. It was natural that it should be scarcely visible wherever the heat of the combat exclusively attracted attention; on the other hand, it necessarily appeared in power wherever, by the influence of circumstances, the strife was less eager and the passions less excited. Now what party in the primitive Church did circumstances incline to take a peace-making course?

It was not at Jerusalem. Judaizing Christianity abode there in power. According to Eusebius (H. E. iv. 5), the entire Church in that city was composed of Hebrew converts; and it was entirely owing to the force of circumstances, to begin with Adrian (about 130), that this Church consented to select some of its bishops from those who were not circumcised. It was not less so in the Greek Churches of Asia and Europe. It was precisely there that the struggle continued. The Hellenistic spirit, always loving that which is ideal, and, what makes it so attractive, always in the search after truth, carried by philosophical discussions in advance of religious controversies, did not easily yield to a compromise which made the severities of theory subordinate to the necessities of practice. During many ages, it will always be from Greece and from Asia that theological questions and discussions will take their rise. The word *orthodoxy*, and the idea too, is of Greek origin. Gnosticism, Sabellianism, Origenism, Arianism, Athanasianism, &c., are fruits ripened under an Eastern sun.

During the first five centuries, the West would have but two important controversies, which belong peculiarly to itself; one, concerning church government, is connected with Tertullian and Cyprian; the other is connected with questions about divine grace and human liberty, and is personified in Augustine and in Pelagius,—always, as we see, practical and, in a certain sense, earthly questions. The Greek genius is more inclined to traverse the firmament of heaven.

To return to the first century. It is in the West, and always at Rome, that the want of peace will be most keenly felt. The genius of Rome is less poetical, less philosophical, less ideal, than the genius of Greece. It is, in short, more utilitarian and more practical. The Roman legion, and the politics of the Roman senate, each indispensable to the other, both springing from the same positive and ruling genius, united have conquered the world. Rome pontifical will be the heir of this genius, and will be indebted to it for its prolonged power. At Rome they have always loved an external unity and the mere mechanism of government. The inner and spiritual union has there been always regarded as a chimera in comparison with uniformity. In other respects, the Church of Rome has endeavoured from the beginning to reckon amongst its members some representatives of every tendency. It was established—the Epistle to the Romans proves it—before any apostle had ever been there,—a remarkable circumstance when we reflect that at the present day it derives much of its glory from its pretended foundation by the two greatest apostles. The innumerable relations which attracted towards the capital some inhabitants of every province, and the importance of the Jewish colony which was there established—here was the real cause of the spontaneous formation of a Christian Church at Rome. The Jew of Palestine and the Jew of Alexandria, the mechanic of Ephesus and the merchant of Corinth, the orator of Athens and the mathematician of Babylon, there met, there became acquainted and exchanged ideas. Rome at this epoch is an universal and permanent exhibition *(exposition)* of every religion and of every system.

And now picture to yourselves in this new Babylon, in this huge city, where the feeling of individuality is swallowed up, where earthly power attains its greatest splendour, where every language is spoken, where profession is made of every religion, where the idea, concrete and visible, of *humanity*, separates itself from all the national and exclusive ideas that men have brought with them from the heart of their provinces,—picture to yourselves a Pauline believer of Ephesus and a Judaic Christian of Palestine, meeting and recognizing each other in the crowded forum; after some minutes' religious conversation, saying, that they have no hope in this life or the next but in Jesus of Nazareth, crucified under Pontius Pilate, and raised from the dead.

Consider what sympathy, what quick and spontaneous brotherhood, this religious bond tends to create between them. Yonder, in the East, certain differences which they believed to be fundamental would have separated the one from the other. At Rome, these differences would disappear; both continue to be disciples of one crucified and raised from the dead. Do you wish for a parallel case? Suppose that you were in the midst of Pekin, in that gigantic city of the central Empire, and that all at once you were to meet a partisan of certain theological ideas which in Christian Europe you would most resolutely oppose. Thou Calvinist hast met an Unitarian. Thou Anglican of the High and Dry school hast met an Independent. Old Lutheran, thou standest face to face before a disciple of Zwingle. Tell me, in the midst of all these followers of Budda, of all these disciples of Kong-Fu-Dsu or of Lao-Tsu, of all these degrees of mandarins, of all these men who differ from you in every particular, from the mode of thinking to that of taking food, who have, in short, nothing whatever in common with you except human nature in its most abstract acceptation,—would not you cordially give him your hand immediately on discovering that he with whom you talked was a man who believed with you in Jesus, the Son of God and the Saviour of mankind? You would not, doubtless, on that account abjure your individual faith. In that matter you would remain what you were. At Rome, the Judaic Christian would not renounce his scruples and prejudices. It is probable that he would attempt to inculcate them on the Pauline Christian whom he met. But what a difference is there! How easily is the animosity which in the province kept them apart, changed into alliance in the capital! How well will the fourteenth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans reach its mark in the Imperial city! In heart, each thinks that the other is not far from the kingdom of God. At Jerusalem, one of them, at the least, would have shut out the other.

And afterwards, the persecution of Nero, which raged everywhere at Rome, would help to teach all Pauline and Judaic Christians that all ought to suffer for the name of Jesus Christ, and the blood shed in common would be a motive to union far stronger than all their reasonings. But there will be there two modes of realizing that kind of unity which the peculiarities of Christian sentiment concur in making possible. (The writer then describes the first mode as proceeding from individual thought and conviction sufficiently strong to enable and induce every man to take his own course in religious faith; the other mode is by the establishment of an outward institution which shall speak to all minds with unquestioned spiritual authority.*) The first

* The copy of *Le Lien* from which this translation is made, is unfortunately in several places obliterated, and we have in one or two passages had to guess at the sense from the context.

of these two methods is Christian, individual, Protestant. It is that which the Lord Jesus employed in establishing his kingdom. (See the parables of the Grain of Mustard-seed and the Leaven (Matt. xiii. 31—33), of the Seed which sprang up of itself (Mark iv. 26—29), &c. It is also the method of Paul, who does not pretend to have dominion over the faith of his disciples (2 Cor. i. 24), and who, in making a distinction between *the weak* and *the strong* in faith, and in encouraging the latter to help the former, clearly cherishes the hope that the weak may become strong. The other method of realizing unity, which begins from without, confessedly manifests a certain defiance with regard to truth, and but little respect for individual conscience. This method seeks to obtain by mechanism and organization that which the soul still refuses it. The Roman Catholic system is its perfect development. The external means by which Protestants have so long sought to realize an unity, which has fled the farther from them the more they have laboured to secure it by artificial means—confessions of faith, the decrees of synods, severities against the heterodox, so-called "evangelical alliances," &c. —equally set it forth. In other respects, the way of external authority has a great advantage in the sight of our poor humanity, by creating an illusory idea of the real state of things, by exciting the belief of a real unity where there exists only a factitious unity, and, above all, by its promptitude of action. The spiritual and internal method, besides demanding a belief in the influence of truth, is long actively in existence in the eye of God before it produces any visible results in the sight of man. And this is the reason why so few prefer it.

If the Church had in a body attained the elevation to which the spirit of Jesus encourages it to ascend, it would be by this internal method that a fruitful and living unity would have manifested itself among its members. Let us not forget that the Church, after its early period, though progressive in respect to numbers, yet degenerated in the energy and purity of faith. From the first to the fifteenth century, the Church continued its downward course, and it is only since the Reformation that it has re-ascended. It had descended to such a depth, that it was with difficulty it could re-ascend at all; besides that, to descend, it had only to permit itself to go down, whilst in order to re-ascend a strong effort was necessary. And this is our obstacle—we have to *make an effort.*

We are at a great distance from Rome as it was in the first century. The Church of Rome is then, from its very origin, distinguished by a twofold character,—the organic and practical spirit to which it owes its existence, and in the midst of which it has grown up; and, next, a tendency to neutralize the opposing elements which otherwise, with more or less of violence, rise in mutual opposition, and to make the interests of Christianity,

properly so called, to exercise rule over the hostilities of party. In consequence of this, and with a view of establishing this predominance, it will devote itself to the realization of an external unity by means of a regularly established and permanent ecclesiastical authority. Questions relating to discipline will be regarded by it as of more importance than questions of dogma. The one thing needful will be, not to conceive of Christianity as Paul or as James, but to keep steadfast to the visible body of the Church, represented by its fathers. We must add a certain degree of ambition, at first unconsciously cherished, more slowly avowed, but excited and cherished by the circumstances of its position;—for instance, the feeling of its importance as the Church of the capital, the extensive missionary field which the West offers, and which is peculiarly its own, and the active power which confers upon it external unity. Besides, at this period the *prestige* of the Roman name was no small matter; and as the temporal world had become accustomed to the Roman dominion, the Church of Rome perhaps thought it natural enough that the spiritual world should follow no other opinions than hers. In fact, although we sum up in three lines that which was the work of ages, we find something of all this in the document now lying before us with the title, *The First Epistle of Clement of Rome to the Corinthians.*

In reality, this Epistle is impersonal, and never was the question of its authenticity of less importance. *The Church of God which abides at Rome to the Church of God which abides at Corinth,*—this is the inscription. Is its author really the Bishop or Elder of Rome called Clement, whose name we find elsewhere affixed to certain heterogeneous works? We are inclined to believe it, in the first place, because the character of neutrality which is impressed on the work occasions no necessity for screening it under a pseudonyme intended to give it greater weight; in the next place, because it follows from another book, written a little later at Rome, and of which we shall speak in its turn, the *Pastor of Hermas,* that one of the name of Clement was specially charged by the church of that city to make certain communications to other churches (*Visions*, ii. 4); in the next place, because Hegesippus, a Jewish Christian of the second century, who visited Rome in the time of Anicet (about 160), after tarrying at Corinth, mentions this Epistle, and attributes it to Clement (Eusebius, H. E., iii. 10); and, lastly, because Dennis, the Bishop of Corinth, about 175, attests the high value which in his church they attached to the Epistle of Clement, for they were accustomed to read it there publicly in their religious assemblies (Eusebius, H. E., iv. 23). True it is that this last testimony must be received with some degree of caution, for it comes from the same Dennis who very conscientiously affirmed (id. ii. 25) in an Epistle to the Romans, that Peter and Paul had

founded the church of Corinth as well as that of Rome. An edifying proof this of the truthfulness of the ecclesiastical traditions of the second century!

Is this Clement the same person that we find mentioned (Philipp. iv. 3) amongst the fellow-labourers of Paul? So tradition says. The same tradition ascribes to him the episcopacy of Rome about the year 95, and assigns to him episcopal ordination by Peter, who suffered death under Nero in the year 67. The truth is, that tradition knew nothing about the matter, and we do not know more. It is possible that the Clement of the Philippians was the same as the Clement of Rome; but it is scarcely probable—first, on account of the extreme age which it would be necessary to ascribe to him; next, because we should learn from an affectionate disciple of Paul something different from what is contained in this Epistle; and, lastly, because it would follow from the passage quoted from Philippians, that Clement was a Christian of the Philippian church, dwelling at Philippi and not at Rome.

But, we repeat, it is a matter of very little consequence. The entire interest of the Epistle before us arises from the fact, that it is an official communication from the Church of Rome to that of Corinth, having its date at the end of the first century, and following shortly after the persecution of Domitian. This date, which it is easy to establish from many *data* within the book itself, is generally now-a-days admitted, and by scholars whose critical tendencies are in other respects very divergent, such as Tholuck, Gieseler, Kœstlin, Schliemann, Hilgenfeld, Reuss, &c. The Church of Corinth was then given up to certain internal dissensions. A kind of ecclesiastical revolution had resulted in the forcible deposition of the *presbyters*, who had been regularly invested with the direction of the Church. Hence sprung up some painful controversies and quarrels, to the destruction both of ease and of charity and Christian humility. We see that the Corinthians were then clearly the sons of those to whom Paul wrote those two Epistles with which we are so well acquainted. The Christians of Rome then wrote to them in the spirit of brotherhood, in order to incite them to return to a state of union, and to restore to the deposed *presbyters* the power of which they had been deprived. But if anything is likely to confirm all that we have advanced respecting the *supremely ecclesiastical* spirit which prevailed at Rome respecting that tendency to enforce an external uniformity on individual diversities, at the risk of sacrificing truth to uniformity and the internal life to organization, it is the manner in which they view at Rome the controversy going on at Corinth. Not once, not for an instant, does the Epistle before us enter the central point of the discussion. It is for the Church at Rome sufficient that regular ecclesiastical order has been overthrown at Corinth, to make her throw the blame on

the favourers of the movement. In fact, it is extremely difficult to decide with justice what are the principles and who are the persons engaged at Corinth in strife. It is clear that in the eyes of the Church of Rome, although the Corinthians might have had a thousand good reasons for appointing other *presbyters* in place of those who had previously been set over them, the simple act of making this change put them altogether in the wrong. Assuredly (and we shall return to this point) the First Epistle of Clement of Rome to the Corinthians, which, according to the tradition of Rome, is a bull, a true episcopal letter of admonition, gives a deadly contradiction to the papal pretensions. Assuredly the letter-writing *presbyter*, if he were in these days to re-visit Italy, would not believe his own eyes when he saw what has befallen his Church. But that no one may be under a mistake on this point, all Roman Catholicism has rooted within it this tendency to overlook altogether the reality of things, provided that the form be regular. Before it had Popes, even before it had Bishops, the Church of Rome proclaimed that the ecclesiastical power of its presbyters and of their deacons had been conferred by the apostles, under the direction of Jesus Christ; that the first duty of a Christian is to submit himself, be the case what it may, to established authority, and that revolt against this authority is revolt against God himself. The principle of insubordination is without doubt equally mischievous. An exaggerated sense of individuality is nothing more than egotism, and in its turn becomes tyranny.

It is, after all, possible that the disturbances at Corinth might have been altogether wrong. We know nothing about the matter. But that which is significant is, that we do know nothing about the matter, although we possess a very long Epistle, which has no other object than to mediate between the different parties, to bring them back by the path of persuasion to concord and to peace. We shall endeavour on some other occasion to initiate our readers into the contents of this curious Epistle. At present we limit ourselves to the task of awakening anew this apparition of the ecclesiastical principle dominant over all others in the bosom of the Church of Rome in the first century. It is the foundation-stone of modern Catholicism. Its maxim, "Believe you that which the Church believes, even when you do not know what the Church does believe, even when that which the Church believes outrages your reason and your conscience,"—this maxim, which is nothing else than the denial of individuality and of internal religion, is but the development of the principles which began to dawn in the Epistle of Clement of Rome.

As for the rest, we shall hereafter see from the Epistle itself how much the ecclesiastical dogma and organization of that time differed from what is at the present day called the doctrine and hierarchy of Rome. If the modern theory of *Development*

(adopted, in despair of their cause, by the defenders of the Papacy, who have thus contrived to destroy the edifice so laboriously built up by their predecessors, and especially by Bossuet) can derive any support from the reasoning on which we have remarked, we defy it to deduce the dogma and the organization of the present day from the dogma and organization of former times; unless, in contradiction to common sense and the gospel, they are able to gather grapes from thorns and figs from thistles. (Matt. vii. 16.)

THE THREE HEAVENLY WITNESSES.

Sir,

Amongst the Rules for conducting the Soldiers' and Sailors' Scripture Reading Society in the Crimea, is one headed, "Essential Doctrines" (which are required to be taught). "These doctrines are not in the language which man teacheth, but that of the Holy Ghost." "God is a Spirit, and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth." "There are Three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit, and these Three are one," &c. Now there is abundant evidence that this last text is an interpolation, and consequently was not dictated by the Holy Ghost, or, to say the least, that it is extremely doubtful. It is a text abandoned, I believe, as not genuine, by nearly all Protestant scholars. This fact of its great doubtfulness was either known, or not, by the parties who drew up the Rules in question. If the former, they are guilty of gross impropriety, and a want of truthfulness or concealment, in declaring it to be the language of the Holy Ghost. If the latter, they are guilty of great ignorance, which admits of no excuse in persons drawing up creeds for the belief of their fellow-creatures, which they say it is "essential" they should believe. The Three Heavenly Witnesses ought to be expunged from the copies of our New Testaments. Tricks and imposition in religion are hateful in the extreme.

Bishops Stortford, Nov. 19, 1855. A Unitarian Believer.

ASSISTANCE AT THE MARRIAGE CEREMONY.

Sir,

In a late No. of your periodical, I see it announced that one of *our* ministers was "assisted" by a brother minister during the performance of the marriage ceremony. It would sorely grieve me to learn that such "assistance" was necessary either on the score of ill health or bodily infirmity: but if no such necessity existed, for what purpose was the aid of this second minister required? Was it that he might "*intone*" the service? Or respond in a "*Gregorian*"? Or, lectern fashion, hold the "manual of devotion"? Or direct the bridegroom how, with becoming grace and solemnity, to place the magic circlet on the finger of the bride? Mr. Editor, in plain words, is this an aping of Puseyite pretension and trickery amongst *sober Unitarians?* If so, I beseech you—

Nip it in the Bud.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

Memoirs of the Life and Writings of James Montgomery, including Selections from his Correspondence, Remains in Prose and Verse, and Conversations on various Subjects. By John Holland and James Everett. Vols. III. and IV. London—Longman and Co. 1855.

In an early No. of the present Volume (pp. 133—155), we gave a sketch of the early life of the Sheffield Poet, mainly but not entirely founded on the first two volumes of this Biography. A comparatively short space will enable us to give all the important incidents in the middle period of Montgomery's life related in the two dreary volumes now before us. This instalment of the Biography (if such it can with propriety be called) extends over eighteen years, from 1813 to the close of 1830, the poet being at the earlier date 42 years of age. He was at this time engaged in the completion of another of his larger poems, "The World before the World," a somewhat daring subject, requiring "a large web of fiction involving a small fact of Scripture." For such an enterprize he had the authority of Milton; and without hinting any approximation to the great author of the sublime religious epic, we may assign to Montgomery considerable success in his enterprize. He has in "The World before the Flood" pleasingly fulfilled his design of presenting a similitude of events that might have happened in the first age of the world. In his picture of the religion of the patriarchal world, he has very unnecessarily, and with no addition to the verisimilitude of the story or to its poetical power, dragged in allusions to the doctrine of Christ's atonement. In the first instance, Montgomery designed to publish this poem in a very meagre and incomplete state, containing only four cantos. The judicious criticism and honest remonstrance of his friend Mr. Parken, of the Eclectic Review, induced the poet first to delay and then greatly to enlarge and improve this poem. The Death of Adam, one of the sweetest and most perfect efforts of Montgomery's muse, did not form any part of the original poem, which simply related the subjugation of the Giants. It is interesting to learn that large portions of this poem were composed by its author during long solitary walks, and that the beautiful scenery around Sheffield sometimes suggested to his fancy the charming representations scattered through the poem of the antediluvian world.

A letter from Montgomery to Mr. Roscoe mentions the singular fact that the poem was published without a revision of the proofs by the author; and notwithstanding Mr. Ballantyne's care, some provoking mistakes crept into the text.* The public proved their admiration of the poem by buying 4000 copies of it in less than two years.

Shortly after the publication of this work, Montgomery made his first

* Those were the days of high and double and treble postage, when a revised proof from Edinburgh to Sheffield might have cost a lawyer's fee. Great are the obligations of authors and printers for recent privileges in the matter of book and "copy" postage. Let them be duly expressed, and the hands of the executive strengthened against the rising and extortionate demands of railway companies, who having during their twenty years of monopoly and mismanagement failed to supply the public with the cheap carriage of small parcels, now resent the liberality and justice of the Government in stepping forward to supply a wide-felt want.

appearance on a platform, and addressed the friends of the Sunday-school Union in Sheffield on the occasion of their first anniversary meeting. Subsequently he became a very frequent attendant and speaker at Bible, School and Missionary meetings. His addresses were generally very superior to the average specimens of evangelical oratory, and were entirely free from the exaggeration and evident insincerity which sometimes disfigure the religious platform. Conceding this praise, we are compelled to add, that they were sometimes very homiletic and rather dull, and that his biographers have been mercilessly indiscriminate in their insertions of them in these volumes. The only political event connected with this year in Montgomery's life was his preparation of the Sheffield address to the Regent on the momentous victory of Leipsic,—a composition of great vigour of thought and equal beauty of style,—a remarkable contrast to many similar documents framed in the offices of town clerks and the chambers of recorders.

In the year 1814, he was, at his own earnest desire, re-admitted as a member of the Moravian church at Fulneck. He continued still to associate with Methodists and Calvinists, and habitually to worship with the former sect. This circumstance led to his intimacy with Mr. Everett, one of his biographers,—a misfortune equally to himself and the public.

He continued for many years to edit the *Iris*. But as a political engine that journal ceased to exercise any large influence. Its excellent and conscientious editor was ill qualified for the hard service of political warfare. His moderation almost amounted to timidity. Writing to a friend in the year 1816, a year of much trial and difficulty to him and others, he said—"Politics I hate with so perfect a hatred—I have suffered so much in property, in feeling and in character, from violence and illiberality in the outset of my career—that I meddle with them no more than I can help."—III. 103.

Towards the close of that year, he took as a partner the son of a Sheffield clergyman. The result was disappointment, if not loss, to all concerned. In business matters Montgomery was eminently unworldly. He could not read character in actual life, however powerfully he sometimes described it in the imaginary world. A large investment of property (large in proportion to his means) with a Sheffield manufacturer named Dickenson, led to loss on loss, to the necessity of further advances, and to anxiety and disappointment. In meeting all pecuniary responsibilities, implied as well as formal, he was nobly conscientious, and on several occasions is said to have exposed himself to foreseen loss, in despite of the advice and persuasions of legal and other friends. He was as slow in exacting payment from others, as he was prompt in discharging all demands against himself. The consequence was, that though his means were always equal to his wants, he never became a rich man. He had the good fortune to fall in with honest and liberal publishers,—the respectable and wealthy house of Longman and Co.,—who published his poems at their own expense and hazard, and annually divided the profits of them with him. Besides the faithful performance of their bond, they occasionally, after successful seasons in the sale of his works, sent him handsome gratuities.

Amongst the Sheffield clergy was an amiable and earnestly religious man, Mr. Cotterill, the perpetual curate of St. Paul's church. Between

him and Mr. Montgomery casual intercourse ripened into friendship. The poet had revised for the clergyman a selection of Hymns for public worship, and had added some of his own simple and beautiful devotional lyrics to the volume. Some of the parishioners, actuated, we suppose, by the intolerant spirit of High-church, resented the introduction of this Hymn-book into the worship of the parish church. To stop its growing fame and circulation, they took proceedings against Mr. Cotterill in the Ecclesiastical Court at York. Fortunately for all parties, this unseemly strife was soon stopped; for the matter being, by consent, referred to the amiable and conscientious Archbishop of the diocese, he proposed a new Selection, partly from the Sheffield collection and partly from his own in use at Bishopthorpe; and, to remove all discontent, generously gave copies of the amended Hymn-book to the seat-holders of St. Paul's, in lieu of those they had purchased.

In 1819, Montgomery published his "Greenland," a poem admitted by its author to be incomplete and in some degree a failure. This poem is deeply tinctured by the author's religious prepossessions, and is in reality a missionary and a Moravian poem. The first three cantos, in fact, contain a history of the ancient Moravian church, its revival in the beginning of the 18th century, the original missions by that people to Greenland, and the voyage of the three first missionaries, David and the two Stachs. By his almost exclusive adherence to the religious aspect of his subject, the poet shut himself out from topics full of poetical capability. One almost wonders that the book of Psalms did not by its example induce him to describe the great monster of the deep whose presence in the Greenland sea is one of its patent facts. The bard who afterwards so exquisitely described the wondrous workings in ocean of the coral insect, would not have been unequal to the description of the leviathan of the deep. The volume which contained "Greenland" was floated into comparative popularity by a number of minor poems of considerable merit.

The politics of England became in the year 1819 rough and exasperated. The tendencies of the town of Sheffield, always liberal and democratic, went far beyond the mild conservatism of the gentle editor of the *Iris;* some even of his personal friends at this time took part in the establishment of the "Sheffield Independent," designed to give utterance to the aspirations for Reform and Liberal Government which animated a large portion of the townspeople. This was a significant hint to the poet that he was in a wrong place on the editor's stool. His biographers quote with approbation some sweeping and indiscriminate censures penned by Montgomery at this time against the radicalism which prevailed in all the populous towns of England. Looking back to that time, we can see and admit that there was in popular politics much extravagance and exaggeration; but it was an almost necessary reaction against blind misgovernment and gross corruption. Statesmen like Eldon, Sidmouth, Castlereagh and Vansittart, who habitually sacrificed the interests of their country to gratify their party predilections or antipathies, endangered the constitution as much by the spirit they roused in their opponents, as by that they fostered in their partizans.

When, in 1820, the Government carried its obnoxious restrictions on the newspaper press of the country, Montgomery uttered some indignant remonstrances, but his views were not echoed heartily by the leading

organs of the newspaper press, and Tory legislation for a time prevailed.

The prosecution of Richard Carlile in 1821, for vending blasphemous publications, called forth from many organs of the religious world expressions of satisfaction, and amongst them we regret to record the name of the editor of the *Iris*. Founding his opinion on the dictum that Christianity is part and parcel of the law of the land, he argued that it was a necessary consequence that those who reviled Christianity ought to feel the weight of an outraged law. It is now somewhat better understood that religious liberty, man's birthright, includes the liberty to reject as well as to receive religion; and experience has proved that religion can best defend itself against assailants of every kind without the aid of legal penalties. To leave the vantage-ground of reason and argument, and to call in the constable to the aid of Christianity, is a blunder on the part of Christian advocates of which infidelity has not been slow to take advantage.

The circumstance of Robert Hall's preaching at Sheffield on the vicarious sacrifice of Christ, led to a conversation between Montgomery and one of his biographers, in which the former is represented as saying,—

> "For my part, I cannot conceive in what any alleged efficacy of the atoning sacrifice of Christ could consist, abstracted from his Godhead; and the opposers of the one very consistently—because necessity is laid upon them—relinquish the other. The doctrines stand or fall with each other; and before Socinians can hope to get rid of the Divinity of Christ, they must burn the Bible,—and even then would that doctrine be seen rising out of the ashes of the imperishable word of truth."—III. 314.

If this be a specimen of Montgomery's habitual treatment of matters of religious controversy, we have no reason to regret their general absence from his writings. If his argument for the Atonement is good for anything, it rests on the painful, abhorrent, and, we must add, blasphemous idea of a *crucified and dying God*. It was not alone the man Christ Jesus that died on the cross, for humanity could not offer a sufficient atonement; it was God alone who could pay to Himself an adequate ransom for sinful man! If Montgomery's idea respecting the inseparable connection between the doctrine of the Atonement and Christ's essential Deity is true, the prospects of evangelical religion are at the present time far from satisfactory. It is matter of notoriety that the doctrine of the Deity of Christ is rapidly giving way in intelligent "orthodox" circles, and is being supplanted by Sabellianism. The Trinity now accepted by thoughtful men is not a Trinity of persons, but of attributes and offices. Wherever this view is adopted, the foundation of the Atonement is undermined, and, according to Mr. Montgomery, it must inevitably fall. But we gladly turn to wiser sayings of the poet. At a meeting held at Sheffield in December, 1822, he spoke one of the two great speeches of his life, vindicating and eulogizing Hallamshire as a soil that, properly tilled, might produce its philosophers, artists and poets, not inferior to those of highest classic fame. He pointed to four men of his own generation who had done especial honour to their native town,—Mr. Salt, in botany; Mr. Sylvester, in experimental philosophy; the Rev. Joseph Hunter, in antiquities; and Chantrey, in sculpture. We cannot give a better specimen of Montgomery's prose eloquence than his tribute to the third of these Sheffield worthies:

"The Rev. Joseph Hunter, now of Bath, has done honour to this neighbourhood by a different exhibition of talent. He indeed had the advantage of better early instruction than either of the two former worthies; to which a classical education was afterwards added.* His late work, entitled 'Hallamshire,' has not only most accurately illustrated the place that gave him birth, in a topographical view, and given him a name among the first antiquaries of the age, but the spirit and ability with which he has portrayed the men and recorded the events of ages gone by, raise him to the dignity of an historian, since on the annals of a small district his pen has conferred the dignity of history. There is a splendid and affecting prediction towards the close of the first Georgic of Virgil, in which the poet, alluding to the field of Philippi, yet reeking with slaughter, anticipates the time when the husbandman ploughing the long fallowed ground, shall turn up weapons of death corroded with rust, and stand in amazement to see, disinterred at his feet, the mighty bones of heroes that fell amid the conflict when Roman slew Roman in worse than civil wars. After the lapse of many generations, Mr. Hunter has passed his antiquarian plough over his native soil, and if he has not dislodged rusty javelins, empty helmets, and giant skeletons, he has done much more. While we range over the adjacent country, with his pages in recollection, we see Hallamshire as it was, not less than as it is. He has rebuilt the castle at the bridge, and the manor house on the hill; he has raised from the dust into life and activity again the Talbots and the Howards of the old time. In pomp of chivalry, and followed by long retinues of vassals, our imagination may behold them parading through their magnificent park, where the trees of centuries (long fallen before the desolating axe) are reinstated in their ancient grandeur, and stand thick over all the ground. Nay, within the very enclosure, hallowed by many a sad as well as proud remembrance, where Mary of Scotland, during her cruel captivity, was accustomed to wander and weep with her faithful adherents, we may follow her footsteps, not only in the light which our learned topographer has thrown around them, but led by a minstrel of her own sex (Miss Mary Roberts), now living (I believe *born*) where she was a prisoner, and who has sung her sorrows in numbers worthy of the theme, and alike honourable to herself and the poetical character of this vicinity."—III. 384—386.

It was a fitting compliment to Mr. Montgomery that he was elected one of the first Vice-presidents and afterwards President of the Institution thus eloquently inaugurated.

In 1824, he published two small volumes, appropriately entitled, "Prose by a Poet." Southey said of it, "none but a poet could have written such prose." Montgomery's intercourse with the poets and literati of his age, though very occasional, was always genial, such as became him and them. On one occasion he was invited to meet Moore, visiting in the neighbourhood of Sheffield, but declined the gratification because, many years previously, he had penned for the Eclectic Review a severe article on that author's "Odes and Epistles," and, not being aware whether the fact was within the knowledge of Moore, thought it more becoming his own dignity, and more respectful to the other poet, not to put himself in his way. The delicacy of feeling was respected by those who most lamented the loss of Montgomery's society on the occasion. It is on many accounts to be regretted that Montgomery did not act on the idea which suggested itself to him, of writing a note to Moore, avowing himself the author of the obnoxious article. We cannot doubt the generous reply of forgiveness and welcome which the poet assailed would have given to his brother bard, and the circumstance would have

* Manchester College, York, was the alma mater of this distinguished man.

thrown no slight additional interest on their meeting. In commenting on this matter, the biographers, with blundering dulness, commend Montgomery's wisdom in sending an apology in general terms.

It was in the year 1825 that Montgomery, then fifty-four years of age, made arrangements for transferring to another the property and editorship of the *Iris*. In his farewell address he was able honestly to declare, that from the first moment of his becoming the director of a public journal, his determination was, "Come wind or sun, come fire or flood, to do what was right." This was the polar star to which his compass pointed, though, he modestly admitted, with considerable variation of the needle. His fellow-townsmen did honour to the purity of his motives and the blameless innocence and highmindedness of his career as a public instructor, and signalized their respect for his character and his past services by inviting him to a public dinner. Lord Milton, a nobleman of congenial purity of mind and independence of character, presided, and the speech of the ex-editor on his retirement from public life was worthy of himself and the occasion.

He afterwards put his popularity in the town of his adoption to a severe test by proposing, in a meeting of the vestry, a church-rate. It was refused by an overwhelming majority, and this was the last occasion of the attempt being made in Sheffield to carry a church-rate.

The only other incidents in the life of Montgomery contained in these two volumes were the publication of two poetical works. The first was, "The Christian Psalmist," chiefly a selection from the best sacred lyrics in the English language, but enriched by the editor with a hundred original compositions, some of which have already taken rank with the best hymns used in public worship. Certain it is with Montgomery, as it was with Watts, that the merit of the hymns, as poems, was in the inverse ratio of their peculiar orthodoxy. The highest devotional strains of both authors, and those which have everywhere extorted admiration, are just those hymns which the Unitarian would select as embodying his own faith and hope.* The other publication was the "Pelican Island," a work of great originality and considerable poetical beauty. The description of the coral rock and its gradual formation is a fine specimen of the poet's genius, and drew forth applause from critics of very different modes of thought. With his habitual blundering in criticism, the chief biographer tells us that this poem, to be seen in its true light, must be "viewed in the coincident foci of evangelical and moral truth;" and then, to illustrate what he means (which was rather necessary) tells us that the greater part of the last canto of the poem was read with propriety and effect by a minister of the gospel from his pulpit. This is a strange test of the goodness of a poem. Many a sorry poet has made a very useful preacher. It would be about as wise as to test a statesman's capacity for his functions by his analytic skill in the chemist's laboratory.

We have now given all the important facts bearing on the life of Montgomery contained in the seven hundred and eighty pages of these two volumes. The quantity of trivial matter, of narratives of facts contemptibly insignificant, would be incredible to any one who has not

* At a recent Unitarian anniversary in the north-west of England, all the hymns were taken from Montgomery's poems without the alteration of a word, and were universally acceptable.

waded through the book; such as Mr. Everett's publishing a book about Methodism, and Mr. Holland sending a copy of a poem to Mr. Montgomery, and Mr. Everett's horror at being shut up in the dusk of the evening in Hault Hucknall church, and dreading lest the ghost of Hobbes, the "infidel philosopher," buried there, should rise and address him! And before we can bring the matter to a close, we must undergo a similar infliction and waste another guinea. Had the public been honestly told that the biography was to be spun out by these conceited and incapable gentlemen into six volumes, they would have allowed the publication to lie in Paternoster Row, and left the editors and their publisher to settle between them their respective losses. In addition, however, to the pecuniary loss to buyers, and the loss of time to readers, there is the enormous wrong done to the fair fame of Montgomery by having his name associated with so much that is trifling and silly, and by exciting in the public mind a feeling of resentment, where pleasure and gratitude should and might have been the result.

The Unitarians and the British and Foreign School Society. A Plain Statement of Facts. By Henry Dunn. Printed for Private Circulation. 8vo. Pp. 24. 1855.

This pamphlet comes into our hands just as we are putting our last sheet to press. As it is the habit of Unitarian Christians to hear and read both sides of a question, we hasten, at some inconvenience to ourselves, to lay an analysis, necessarily prepared in haste, of this latest defence of himself by the Secretary of the British and Foreign School Society before our readers. It appears that Mr. Dunn has seen some report of the recent Birmingham meeting in the *Daily News* of Nov. 1. Of the source of that report we know nothing, and, not having seen it, cannot avouch or impugn its accuracy. If Mr. Dunn's references to it fairly represent it, it is not in every particular correct. Mr. D. says in the outset that he is accused by the Unitarian body, represented by their ministers and delegates assembled in Birmingham, of continued misrepresentation. To this charge he pleads not guilty in these words:

"I deny the charge, and call upon those who uttered or endorsed it to justify their words.

"I calmly and deliberately repeat the statement I made to Lord Monteagle and Dr. Lushington, that in relation to Unitarians *there has been no change whatever in the system pursued at the Borough-Road School.*" (The italics are Mr. Dunn's).

Now here we must pause for a moment to remark on the slippery character of the Secretary of the British and Foreign School Society. He affects in this passage to repeat the statement made to Lord Monteagle and Dr. Lushington, and, in so doing, contrives to give a new version of that statement. That our readers may judge for themselves of the truth of the charge we bring against Mr. Dunn, we give in its precise words the document transmitted to the British and Foreign Unitarian Association:

"We have often expressed our opinion, and now repeat it, that the British and Foreign School Society was founded on the principle of religious equality, as regarded all professing the Christian faith; that in order to carry out this principle the Scriptures were to be read in all the Schools, carefully excluding all catechisms and all formularies of faith; that this principle was to be applied to all *oral* teaching, as well as to the books used.

"We consider, therefore, that the Schools are open to those professing Unitarian opinions, as well as to any other Christians. In communicating with Mr. Dunn, these principles were distinctly acknowledged as the principles on which the Society was formed, and Mr. Dunn asserted that they had not been violated.

"The question, therefore, is one of fact, which we have not the means of satisfactorily investigating.

"MONTEAGLE.

"February 27th, 1854." "STEPHEN LUSHINGTON.

Our readers will see that the statement made by Mr. Dunn to Lord Monteagle and Dr. Lushington was, that there had been no violation, either by the use of catechisms or formularies or by oral teaching, of the *principles on which the Society was formed.* In his professed reiteration of that statement, Mr. Dunn alters it to the assertion that there has been no change *in the system pursued.* The practice may from an early period have been in opposition to the principles of the Society. Mr. Dunn's present pamphlet, like his former Letter to Mr. James Heywood, is an attempt to shew that the practice has been from the first to inculcate in the Borough-Road School the doctrines of orthodox Christianity. It would doubtless be very convenient to him to narrow the controversy within these limits. He will probably defend himself against the charge we now bring against him, by pointing to a passage ascribed to Mr. Mark Philips at Birmingham, which is conspicuously put on the title-page of the present publication. Whether or not Mr. Philips uttered the words ascribed to him is quite unimportant. The scope of his introductory statement had reference, not to the practice, but to the principles of the Society. The first resolution passed at that meeting is distinctly based on the original principle of the institution, and alleges the violation of it by the subsequent practice. In order to shew what the practice of the Society has from the first been, Mr. Dunn produces the testimony of the late Mr. John Picton, who was the first superintendent of the Model School. He declares that no text of Scripture was ever omitted in the School in order to meet the views of any class of objectors; that the teachers were never forbidden to question the children on the plain and grammatical meaning of any text of Scripture whatever; that Lancaster and Fox would never have consented to compromise the doctrines of the Trinity and the Atonement; that Unitarians, though personally cognizant of the fact that these doctrines were taught, did not regard such teaching as any infringement of the comprehensive principle of the Society.

Mr. Picton, who thus knows the opinion of the Unitarian as well as the orthodox founders of the Society, declares, in addition, that Mr. Fox was the author of certain letters in defence of the Lancasterian plan of teaching, in reply to Professor Marsh; and in these letters Mr. Lancaster is represented as teaching that the leading and uncontroverted doctrines of Scripture were those received and acknowledged by every class of Christians who do not think it idolatry to address worship to Jesus Christ.

On this statement Mr. Dunn remarks, that the Unitarian founders did not make any complaint then, because they knew that the people of England would not consent to any compromise in popular education of the Divinity of Christ and the Atonement.

The next witness who is called up is Mr. Crossley, who professes to speak as to the practice of the schools for forty-three years, and who

declares that the practice as to the Scripture teaching has been unvaried from 1809 to 1848. Another witness, Mrs. Macrae, had the charge of the religious instruction given in the Female School. She avers that the practice has been unvaried from the first; that the Trinity and the Atonement were taught in the Schools from Scripture as now; and that Unitarian supporters knew of this fact, and spoke of it as a proof of the liberality of their sentiments.

On the strength of this testimony, confirmed by his own evidence, Mr. Dunn felt himself authorized to say to Lord Monteagle and Dr. Lushington, that there had been no violation of the principles of the Society. That there might be no doubt on Mr. Dunn's mind as to what interpretation they put upon the original principles of the Society, they record their conviction, not merely that it was founded on the principle of religious equality as regarded all professing the Christian faith, but that the Schools were open to those professing Unitarian opinions, as well as to any other Christians. Mr. Dunn, in a note (p. 9), admits that it would be a violation of religious liberty to exclude Unitarians from their Schools, and adds, that had they consented to such an exclusion, they should have prevented much of the separate action on the part of the Church of England. The children of Unitarians are not excluded as such from National Schools. But no sane man would quote this fact as a proof of the religious equality of Unitarians in such establishments. But the religious equality of Unitarians is equally violated in British Schools as now conducted. The charge against their conductors is not that passages are read which are supposed to teach the doctrines of the Trinity and Atonement, but that these doctrines are controversially taught in the ordinary routine of school instruction. To all intents and purposes, the work is done by the living voice of the catechist, instead of by a printed catechism.

Mr. Dunn affects to treat the testimony of the Marquis of Lansdowne, Lords Brougham and Fortescue and others, with indifference. He admits that they are unimpeachable witnesses, but considers that they only bear testimony to what has never been denied or disputed. He will hereafter probably learn how important and decisive their testimony is. The "Case" and "Further Case" are mentioned by our author. The former document is described by him as "made up of unsupported assertions, garbled quotations, false references and unauthorized interpretations." It will be remembered that the Case, before being submitted to counsel, was transmitted by the solicitors of the Unitarian Association to the Committee of the British and Foreign School Society, in order that there might be no misrepresentation of the facts. The Committee declined to give any opinion upon it, but contented themselves with the general assertion that they had not departed from the original principles and rules of the Society. If the Committee could have proved the existence in the Case of the "unsupported assertions, garbled quotations," &c., of which Mr. Dunn speaks, their conduct would, we think, have been in 1847 widely different.

From the Case, Mr. Dunn proceeds to the Opinion of Messrs. Jervis *(now Chief Justice of the Court of Common Pleas)* and Rolt. He gives his own version of their Opinion for the benefit of his readers in these words: "Now if I understand this Opinion correctly, it amounts to this—If there be a grievance, which is by no means clear, it is very

questionable whether there is any effectual remedy." Now let it be remembered that this Opinion sets out with this decisive position: "We think the exclusion of all doctrinal teaching, except so far as it necessarily results from the unaided reading of the Scriptures, is a fundamental principle of the Society." The further Opinion given, that if doctrinal distinctions were taught in the School by explanations of or commentaries on the Scriptures, there was a breach of trust, is coolly met by Mr. Dunn with the remark, that the fact assumed in the Opinion is "the very point in dispute." Abounding as this pamphlet does with admissions of the habitual inculcation of doctrinal distinctions, Mr. Dunn's parenthetical assertion is simply puerile.

The Further Case and the second Opinion were rather inconvenient documents for Mr. Dunn to handle, as they could not be stated in any form without proving to Mr. D.'s friends that he had, by his unadvised Letter to Mr. Heywood, greatly strengthened the case against himself and the managers of the Society. He treats the further Opinion as neither judicial nor authoritative; and hints that it was merely got up for show—that the Opinion of the distinguished lawyers was probably accompanied by important information suppressed in the Further Case —and that it was never designed to be acted upon, but merely to be used as "a capital stone to pelt with." This is the return for the long forbearance shewn by the Unitarian objectors.

Perhaps the most extraordinary assertion in this strange pamphlet is its author's allegation that he heartily accepts the judgment of Lord Monteagle and Dr. Lushington, including, of course, the religious equality of the Unitarians with other professing Christians.

Mr. Dunn, on the alleged authority of the report in the *Daily News*, says that one of the remedies proposed at the Birmingham meeting was to "*enlist the sympathies* of the Charity Commissioners,"—a suggestion, he thinks, not complimentary to the judicial spirit of those gentlemen. We may inform Mr. Dunn that the only appeal proposed to the Charity Commissioners was to their sense of justice, and this course has, at the suggestion of a distinguished legal friend, been already adopted. Mr. Dunn adds, with equal accuracy, when speaking of the Birmingham meeting, that "no decision was arrived at." When he reads the resolutions adopted, he will see that he has either deluded himself by his wishes, or been grossly deceived.

There are throughout the pamphlet some painful efforts at pleasantry, which scarcely conceal a mind ill at ease. The Birmingham gathering of forces is described as an "Indignation Meeting." On the authority of an unnamed "humorous friend," the Unitarians are said to be quite as sectarian and just as much priest-ridden as other people, only they don't know it.

There are tokens in this pamphlet of feebleness. The author alludes (we regret to observe) to his own declining health. If this be the cause of any of the inconsistencies on which we have felt it necessary to comment, we are willing to make every allowance, and regret the necessity of publicly censuring a gentleman who has been very zealous for the interests (according to his own view of them) of the British and Foreign School Society, but still more zealous for the propagation of what he considers orthodoxy.

INTELLIGENCE.

PERVERSION OF THE BRITISH AND FOREIGN SCHOOL SOCIETY.

On Tuesday, October 30th, a meeting of Unitarians, convened by circular and public advertisement, was held at Birmingham, to consider and take steps for remedying the breach of trust by the present managers of the British and Foreign School Society. The meeting assembled in the first instance in the spacious vestry of the New meeting, but before the hour appointed for the meeting had struck, the number of persons assembled was so large as to render an adjournment into the chapel necessary. This was accordingly done. The important character of the meeting will appear, if we give the names of the persons from different parts of the kingdom who composed it. The chair was occupied by Mr. Mark Philips.

Bath—Russell Scott, Esq., Thomas Jolly, Esq.

Belper—Rev. R. L. Lloyd.

Birmingham—Rev. Samuel Bache, Rev. Charles Clarke, Timothy Kenrick, Esq., William Wills, Esq., Chas. Clifford, Esq., William R. Wills, Esq., Arthur Ryland, Esq., Robt. Martineau, Esq., Samuel Thornton, Esq., Rev. E. Bristowe, Brooke Smith, Esq., John Francis, Esq., William Hawkes, Esq., Edward Martin, Esq., Dr. Russell, Samuel Smith, Esq., Thomas Martineau, Esq., Henry Smith, Esq., Thos. Gladstone, Esq., Follet Osler, Esq., &c.

Bridgwater—Rev. S. A. Steinthal.

Bristol—Rev. George Armstrong.

Chesterfield—Rev. A. T. Blythe.

Cradley—Rev. William Cochrane.

Dean Row—Samuel Robinson, Esq.

Derby—Rev. Joseph Hutton, LL.D.

Dukinfield—Rev. R. Brook Aspland.

Evesham—Rev. J. C. Lunn.

Gee Cross—Rev. Charles Beard, Thomas Ashton, Esq.

Gloucester—Wm. P. Price, Esq., M.P.

Kingswood—Rev. William Bowen.

Lancaster—Rev. W. H. Herford.

Leeds—Rev. Thomas Hincks, Arthur Lupton, Esq.

Liverpool—Rev. Jas. Martineau, H. A. Bright, Esq., W. J. Lamport, Esq.

London—E. W. Field, Esq., Rev. E. Tagart, J. Ashton Yates, Esq.

Manchester—James Heywood, Esq., M.P., Rev. Wm. Gaskell, R. D. Darbishire, Esq., Rev. J. H. Hutton, Rev. J. P. Ham, Rev. A. W. Worthington, Rev. Dr. Beard.

Norwich—Rev. D. Davis.

Nottingham—Rev. Benj. Carpenter, Charles Paget, Esq.

Oldbury—Rev. William M'Kean.

Rochdale—Rev. W. Smith, T. B. Wood, Esq.

Stockport—Rev. James Bayley.

Stourbridge—Rev. John Dendy, Wm. Akroyd, Esq.

Taunton—William Blake, Esq.

Toxteth Park (Liverpool)—Rev. John Robberds.

Wakefield—Rev. E. Higginson.

Warwick—Mark Philips, Esq., Rich. Greaves, Esq., Rev. D. D. Jeremy.

Wolverhampton—Rev. S. Hunter.

Many of the gentlemen thus named also appeared as representatives of congregations and religious societies. Rev. Geo. Armstrong represented the Western Union, comprehending all the Unitarian congregations in the West of England; Mr. Heywood and others represented a numerous body of Unitarians in Lancashire and Cheshire; Mr. Bright and others represented the Unitarians of Liverpool; Rev. E. Tagart and Mr. Field represented the British and Foreign Unitarian Association; Rev. Edward Higginson represented the Unitarians of Wakefield; Rev. B. Carpenter, &c., those of Nottingham, &c. Many of these deputations brought with them as their credentials resolutions from public meetings and congregations, expressing grave disapprobation of the perversion of the original principles of the British and Foreign School Society, and a willingness to assist in any measures determined upon for its restoration. Many letters were read by the Chairman, by Rev. George Armstrong, Rev. Samuel Bache and Rev. R. B. Aspland, most of them to the same effect, viz., from Rev. Henry Green, Knutsford; Rev. Edmund Kell, Southampton (enclosing the resolutions of the Southern Unitarian Society); Rev. E. Talbot, Tenterden; J. Crook, Esq., M.P., Bolton; Rev. D. Griffiths, Wareham; Rev. P. Coleman, St. Alban's; Rev. W. Forster, London; Rev. J. P. Malleson, Brighton; Rev. Dr. Harrison, Brixton; Rev. J. J. Tayler, London; Rev. Geo. Harris, Newcastle; Rev. J. K. Montgomery, Huddersfield; R. Scott, Esq., Stourbridge; — Fordham, Esq., Royston; J. Strutt, Esq., Belper; Watson Bagehot, Esq., Langport; William Wansey, Esq., London;

J. C. Lawrence, Esq., London; Henry Coppock, Esq., Stockport; James Coppock, Esq., London; Rev. J. L. Short, Bridport; F. Chapple, Esq., Liverpool.

The reading of the letters occupied a very considerable time, but the effect produced by them on the meeting was great, evincing as they did, *all but unanimously*, a strong sense of the wrong committed by the conductors of the Society, and a determination to unite in whatever measures were necessary for its removal. In deference to the opinion and wishes of many gentlemen who thought it desirable that a free conference should be held, and that the freedom should not be trammelled by the expectation of publicity being given to the speeches, reporters were requested to withdraw. We feel it to be a sacred duty to respect the wishes of these friends, and shall attempt no report of the discussion that ensued, beyond stating what the resolutions ultimately adopted by the meeting were, and that the first was carried with perfect unanimity, that the second was adopted by the meeting in preference to one rather less vigorous in its tone. The second and third resolutions were carried by a very considerable majority against amendments, the effect of which would have been to limit the Committee's proceedings to considering instead of acting, and would have entailed the necessity of another general meeting. We are bound to state that the minority contained gentlemen of considerable influence from their station and talents, but the opinion of the meeting was unmistakeably expressed in favour of vigorous and unhampered action. But again and again even those who advocated the largest powers being given to the Committee, expressed their desire, if not their expectation, that there might be no necessity for an appeal to law. For further information on the subject, we would refer our readers to the brief article in the first department of the present number.

The following are the resolutions adopted by the meeting:

1. Moved by Rev. Geo. Armstrong, B.A.—"That it appears from the early documents of the British and Foreign School Society, that the principle on which it was established was—that in training children in the habit of reading the Bible, 'they are left entirely to the explanations and commentaries which their parents or friends may think it their duty to give them at home;' that, from the beginning, the aid of all sects and parties, including Unitarians, was sought and given, the Committee stating in an early report that the institution was founded on this 'simple and comprehensive principle,' in order that it might not 'exclude the aid of any persons professing to be Christians,' and that the plan pursued in the Schools was to afford 'religious instruction without prescribing or rejecting the peculiar creed of any religious party, literally opening the door of education to all.'

"That notwithstanding the unmistakeable breadth and catholicity of the Society's principle, it appears, both from the correspondence of the Secretary, Mr. Dunn, and from several reports of proceedings at annual examinations of the Borough-Road School, that the Society has been perverted from its primary object by the systematic inculcation, in the Borough-Road School, of a peculiar creed, including especially the doctrines of the Deity of Christ and the Atonement."—Seconded by Mr. William Wills.

2. Moved by Mr. Edwin W. Field—"That the British and Foreign School Society was originally intended to fill, and the Legislature has recognized it as filling, a great public educational position; that its perversion to sectarian objects is a public wrong, which it is incumbent on the body immediately affected to repel by all lawful means which are practicable."—Seconded by Rev. Edward Higginson.

3. Moved by Rev. R. B. Aspland—"That a Committee be appointed to consider and to take the best means of carrying out the resolutions of this meeting, and that the Committee consist of the following gentlemen, with power to add to their number:—Mr. Mark Philips, Rev. George Armstrong, Mr. E. W. Field, Mr. Charles Tagart, Mr. J. C. Lawrence, Mr. Wm. Wansey, Mr. W. P. Price, M.P., Mr. J. Ashton Yates and Mr. Charles Paget."—Seconded by Rev. S. A. Steinthal.

4. Moved by Mr. Thos. Jolly—"That a subscription be opened for defraying the expenses hitherto incurred, and for supplying the funds requisite for conducting this business, and that Mr. Mark Philips (Mosley Street, Manchester) be the Treasurer of the fund."—Seconded by Rev. Samuel Bache.

5. Moved by Rev. R. B. Aspland—"That the earnest and long-continued services of Lord Brougham in behalf of religious liberty, and especially his assertion of the rights of Unitarians to

partake equally with other sects of the benefits of the British and Foreign School Society, and his rebuke in Parliament of the breach of trust committed by the present managers of the Society, claim the grateful acknowledgment of this meeting, and that our Chairman be requested to communicate this feeling to him."—Seconded by Mr. W. P. Price, M.P.

6. Mr. Philips having left the chair, and the same having been taken by Mr. W. P. Price, M.P., it was moved by Rev. George Armstrong—"That the best thanks of the meeting be given to Mr. Mark Philips for his kindness in assisting to call the meeting, and in taking the chair, and for the patience, urbanity and talent with which he has presided over it."—Seconded by Rev. Samuel Bache.

7. Moved by Mr. Mark Philips—"That the Rev. Samuel Bache and the members of his congregation are entitled to cordial thanks for granting the use of the New meeting-house on this occasion, and for the trouble they have taken in making arrangements for the meeting."—Seconded by Rev. Edward Tagart.

At the meeting, and subsequently, subscriptions were begun for paying past expenses, and enabling the Committee to prosecute the business entrusted to them. Mark Philips, Esq., £5 (since increased to £100); James Heywood, Esq., M.P., £5; W. P. Price, Esq., M.P., £5; Thomas Ashton, Esq., £5; R. K. Lumb, Esq., £5; H. Coppock, Esq., £5; Thos. Ainsworth, Esq., £5, &c.*

We will only add our cordial congratulations to the friends of religious liberty and unsectarian education on this important movement. Never in our experience did a more important gathering of the Unitarian body take place; and notwithstanding considerable differences of opinion on both theoretical and practical matters (the price we pay for our perfect freedom in forming and expressing opinion), we believe that the right and the really *prudent* decision was taken by the meeting.

* Other subscriptions, of various amounts, are, we believe, announced, but we have not received authority to publish the names. In our next No. we shall probably be able to give a considerable list. In the mean time, we would urge upon all who are interested in the matter, to send their subscriptions to the Treasurer, Mr. Mark Philips, to the care of Mr. Richard Aspden, Mosley Street, Manchester.

PUBLIC MEETING AT BIRMINGHAM ON UNIVERSITY REFORM.

On the evening of October 30th, a public meeting, convened by public advertisement and by circular, of the friends of national unsectarian education, was held at Birmingham, at Dee's Royal Hotel. There were persons present of many sections of the Christian church, including the Church of England, Independent, Baptist and Unitarian. Most of the Unitarian deputies from different parts of England who had taken part in the morning meeting were present. Shortly before seven o'clock, Mr. Jas. Heywood was called to the chair.

In opening the proceedings, the Chairman referred to the Parliamentary movement of 1834 in favour of the abolition of religious tests on secular degrees in the ancient English Universities. Petitions signed by sixty-two resident members of the senate of the University of Cambridge were in that year presented to the Houses of Lords and Commons, suggesting the expediency of abrogating, by legislative enactment, every religious test exacted from members of the University before proceeding to degrees, whether of Bachelor, Master or Doctor, in Arts, Law or Physic. The consideration of the two Houses of Parliament was farther entreated by the Cambridge petitioners to an announcement on their part that they disclaimed all intention of thereby interfering, directly or indirectly, with the private statutes and regulations of individual colleges in the University. Shortly afterwards, counter petitions were presented to Parliament from the majority of the resident members of the senate of Cambridge, against the removal of religious tests from degrees. In the House of Commons, the late Mr. G. W. Wood, M.P., introduced a Bill, practically giving effect to the petition of the liberal minority at Cambridge. This Bill passed the House of Commons, but was opposed by the late Sir Robert Peel, who, among other arguments against the measure, objected to the proposed plan of limiting the removal of religious tests merely to degrees. The Right Hon. Bart. stated his opinion that a Dissenting student who had taken a degree with honours, would not be satisfied unless he were permitted, with his fellow-students and

contemporaries, to try for fellowships, and that the opening of degrees alone would not be a permanent position. He thought that it would be better policy to propose to open those college advantages which were not necessarily of an ecclesiastical character, such as lay fellowships as well as degrees. A majority of the House of Lords voted against the Bill of 1834, and the University of London was subsequently founded, by Royal authority, to confer degrees without the imposition of any religious test. Lord Radnor, Sir Bulwer Lytton, Bart., Mr. Christie, and other Members of Parliament, brought forward motions from time to time to ventilate the subject of University Reform. The following extracts from two letters of the Rev. Sydney Smith on the Universities, convey some idea of the state of public opinion. In 1831, the Rev. divine thus wrote to the Countess of Morley: "—— has been to Cambridge to place his son; in other words, he has put him there to spend his money, to lose what good qualities he has, and to gain nothing useful in return. If men had made no more progress in the common arts of life than they have in education, we should at this moment be dividing our food with our fingers, and drinking out of the palms of our hands." In 1834, the Rev. Canon Sydney Smith wrote to the Countess Grey: "I am for no more movements; they are not relished by Canons of St. Paul's. When I say 'no more movements,' however, I except the case of the Universities, which, I think, ought to be immediately invaded with inquirers and commissioners. They are a crying evil." Among the parents of Oxford and Cambridge students, dissatisfaction has long been felt on account of the idleness and extravagance occasionally manifested in those ancient seats of learning. A memorial, signed by about three hundred members of the two old Universities, and by various Fellows of the Royal Society, was presented to Lord John Russell when he was Prime Minister, recommending an address to the Crown for the appointment of a Royal Commission of Inquiry into the ancient Universities and their colleges; and a motion was afterwards made in the House of Commons, founded upon the prayer of the memorialists. During the debate on this subject in 1850, Lord John Russell declared in the House of Commons his intention of advising Her Majesty to issue her Royal Commission of Inquiry into the Universities of Oxford, Cambridge and Dublin. He did not, however, propose to recommend that the question of the admission of Dissenters should be considered by the Commissioners. In 1852, the Reports of the Royal Commissioners were published; a Tutors' Association was formed at Oxford; and in 1854, Mr. Gladstone, at that time Chancellor of the Exchequer, carried an Oxford Improvement Bill, transferring the governing powers of the heads of colleges to an academical council composed of representatives, in equal numbers, of three classes of Oxford residents; one third of the new council being heads of colleges; one third, professors of the University; and the remaining one third, members of the congregation or resident academical senate of Oxford. The election of the representatives of each of these three classes was vested in the members of the congregation or resident academical senate, a large proportion of whom are clerical fellows of colleges; hence the preponderating ecclesiastical feeling of the University influenced every section of the new council. The Rev. Canon Stanley was not elected, and Professor Pusey obtained a seat on the council by a decided majority of votes. The Oxford Act, when finally passed, included clauses for the removal of all religious tests, both from matriculation and from the first or Bachelor's degree in Arts, Law and Medicine; but a limitation was introduced in the House of Lords by the Bishop of Oxford, requiring that the former religious tests for the degree of Bachelor should be maintained for all offices previously held by members of the Church of England, and for which the Oxford degree of Bachelor had been a qualification.—On the question of the colleges of Oxford and Cambridge, Professor Malden, in his work on the origin of Universities, expressed his opinion, that if institutions originally private so completely control a public institution that no one can become a member of the public institution except he is also a member of one of the private institutions, the public institution does not become private, but the private institutions become public.—The colleges of Oxford, according to the Royal Commissioners of 1850, have now become national institutions, and in like manner the same change may be observed to have taken place at Cambridge.—During the last

session, a Bill relating to the University of Cambridge was introduced by the Lord Chancellor into the House of Lords; but its provisions, although based on the Report of the Cambridge Royal Commissioners of 1850, were by no means satisfactory to the majority of the members of that Commission; and the Dean of Ely (Dr. Peacock), Sir John Herschel, Bart., the Master of the Rolls (Sir John Romilly), Professor Sedgwick, and the Public Orator of Cambridge (the Rev. W. H. Bateson), signed a letter, as members of the Commission, to the Prime Minister, in which they mentioned the Oxford Act as superior to the Bill proposed for Cambridge, and suggested important modifications in that measure. Mr. Macaulay, Mr. Strutt, and other Members of the House of Commons interested in academical improvement, also expressed in private their unwillingness to sanction such an inadequate measure; and at the close of the session the Bill was withdrawn by the Government, without any public discussion of its merits amongst the representatives of the people.—Mr. Bouverie, M.P., had undertaken the conduct of this Bill in the House of Commons; and as it was understood by various Members of Parliament that he would have the management of a new Bill for the improvement of the University of Cambridge, a deputation to confer with him, on behalf of the present meeting, was considered to be desirable, in order that the measure introduced by the President of the Poor-law Board might be in harmony with the present state of public opinion on University Reform. The clauses for the opening of matriculation and of the Bachelor's degree at Oxford were carried by a firm expression of public opinion, manifested as well in petitions to Parliament as in letters from influential individuals in different constituencies to their Parliamentary representatives. The experience of the Oxford Act, however, shews that this little instalment of University Reform has merely been an assertion of the principle of religious liberty, and that a more comprehensive measure is needed to carry out in a practical manner the opening by Parliament of the ancient English seats of learning: the case this evening before us is that of the University of Cambridge.

The Chairman then called on Rev. R. W. Dale, who in a speech of great liberality and force, which we regret our inability to report, moved the following resolution—"That the University of Cambridge, as a great school of liberal education, is capable of a freer range, and of more extended usefulness: it is therefore expedient to throw open the advantages of its system of education, under proper securities, as widely as the State has thrown open the avenues to civil rights and honours; and as a Bill for the improvement of the University and Colleges of Cambridge is likely to engage the attention of Parliament during the ensuing Session, provision should be therein made for a comprehensive plan of academical reform, and for the appointment of Commissioners in accordance with the present state of public opinion with reference to the Universities."—The resolution was very ably seconded by Mr. Mark Philips and unanimously adopted.

The Rev. Dr. Badham then moved—"That the matriculation of students in the University of Cambridge has never been accompanied by any religious test: the course of instruction originally laid down in the Cambridge University statutes, for the Degree of Bachelor of Arts, was of a secular character. Even now the examination for the Bachelor's Degree, with mathematical honours, is purely scientific; but when a student has successfully passed this examination, he is required to declare himself a *bona-fide* member of the Church of England, as by law established, before he is allowed to take his Degree. No examinations are held for higher degrees at Cambridge; a test of the Seventeenth Century is however still maintained, and the subscription for the Degree of Master of Arts includes the acknowledgment of the spiritual or ecclesiastical supremacy of the Sovereign, the exclusive use of the Book of Common Prayer in public worship, and belief in the whole of the Thirty-nine Articles; this Degree of Master of Arts, or some higher Degree, being the qualification of an elector to vote for the Parliamentary representatives of the University. It is therefore the opinion of this Meeting, that all such religious tests for Degrees should be abolished."—The resolution was seconded in a brief but eloquent speech, which was warmly applauded, by Mr. H. A. Bright, of Liverpool, and was carried unanimously.

The Chairman then called on Rev.

Jenkyn Brown, who moved, with appropriate introductory remarks, the third resolution — "That in order to place the University and Colleges of Cambridge in harmony with the present state of public opinion in this country, it may be expedient to remove the restrictions of compulsory ordination, and of conformity to the Liturgy of the Church of England, from Professorships, College Headships, and College Fellowships; to open University Degrees in Arts, Law, Medicine, and Music, without any religious test; to reconsider the monastic regulations of compulsory celibacy for the Fellows of Colleges; to encourage the studies of Modern History, Modern Languages, and Practical Science, by setting apart a gradually increasing fund for the cultivators of such departments of knowledge; to arrange for the suspension of alternate Fellowships as they become vacant in all the Colleges of the University, so as to create an academical appropriation fund, under the control of Parliamentary Commissioners; to reduce University expenses; to abolish antiquated distinctions at College, between the sons of noblemen and the members of other classes of society; and to separate more exactly the special instruction of the candidates for holy orders in the Church of England, from the general academical system of study." — It was forcibly seconded by Rev. Samuel Bache and adopted.

The fourth resolution, moved by Mr. Samuel Robinson, of Wilmslow, was this—"That the publication of an English translation of the Latin Statutes, both of the University and Colleges of Cambridge, would assist the progress of Academical Reform; and that a fund be raised by voluntary contributions to complete the translation already before the public."—It was seconded by Mr. Middlemore and passed.

The fifth resolution was very ably introduced by Mr. W. P. Price, M.P., of Gloucester—"That Commissioners, who can give time and attention to a complete revision of the Cambridge academical system, and can likewise investigate the application of the funds of the University and Colleges, which collectively amount in round numbers to £200,000 per annum, should be appointed by Parliament, with adequate remuneration for their services, and instructions for the annual publication of reports of their proceedings, with an English edition of the new academical laws, sanctioned by their authority." It was seconded by Mr. J. Ashton Yates, of London, and adopted.

Mr. Henry Smith, of Birmingham, then moved—"That a deputation, consisting of James Heywood, Esq., M.P., W. P. Price, Esq., M.P., Wm. Scholefield, Esq., M.P., Mark Philips, Esq., H. A. Bright, Esq., Rev. Thos. Madge, and Rev. Jas. Martineau (with power to add to their number), be appointed to request an interview, and to confer with the Right Hon. E. P. Bouverie, M.P., on the Cambridge Bill, which he is expected to introduce into the House of Commons in the ensuing Session, and to represent to him the national importance of a comprehensive plan of Cambridge Academical Reform, including the appointment of suitable Commissioners, and the annual publication of their reports."—The resolution, having been seconded by Mr. C. Paget, was adopted.

The Rev. E. Higginson, of Wakefield, then moved—"That the deputation be requested to report to a meeting to be summoned at such time and place as they may think fit."

The chair, having been vacated by Mr. Heywood, was taken by Mr. W. P. Price, M.P.

In moving the thanks of the meeting to the Chairman, Rev. Jas. Martineau forcibly dwelt on the various services rendered by Mr. Heywood to the cause of University Reform and Liberal Education. The motion was seconded by Rev. Edward Tagart and carried by acclamation.

It may be proper for us here to state, that, since the meeting was held, we have heard with regret that some doubts exist whether the Cabinet is prepared to re-introduce a measure respecting the Reform of the University of Cambridge. We know, at all events, that at present Mr. Bouverie is not authorized to bring the subject before Parliament. But the country, after having received, in connection with Oxford, a substantial instalment of University Reform, will not endure the continuance of Cambridge in its present unsatisfactory state. The deputies appointed at Birmingham will doubtless vigilantly watch the course of events, and will take care to offer to Government timely notice of the opinions and wishes of the gentlemen assembled at Birmingham. We feel some confidence that the Government of Lord Palmerston will not slight so important an expression of public sentiment.

BOLTON DISTRICT UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION.

The autumn meeting of this Association was held at Monton on Thursday, October 11th. The chapel is pleasantly situated on a green, contiguous to the grounds of Worsley Hall, from which circumstance it is usually called Monton Green. The hamlet of Monton is in the township of Barton and the parish of Eccles, lying a few miles west of Manchester. At a place called Monk's Hall, near Eccles, one of the ejected ministers, the Rev. Roger Baldwin, gathered the elements of a Nonconformist congregation, and continued its pastor till his death, June 9th, 1695. In that year, another of the silenced divines, the Rev. Thomas Crompton, M.A., succeeded to his charge, and officiated till his death in 1699. Two years prior to that event, land had been secured on the present site, which was more conveniently situated for the congregation, and a chapel erected thereon was opened for public worship in the year 1699, under the pastoral care of the Rev. Jeremiah Aldred. The Rev. John Chorley succeeded him in 1729, whose ministry extended to 1764, subsequently to which period the congregation have enjoyed the services of several eminent and useful ministers, amongst whom may be mentioned the names of the Revds. Harry Toulmin and George Wiche, both of whom ended their days in America, and the Rev. Robert Smethurst, whose protracted and useful ministry is still fresh in the recollection of many of the congregation.

At this chapel, the representative of the Nonconformist interest in this neighbourhood for more than a century and a half, the Association held its first meeting since Monton had become incorporated with the other congregations of the district, and, notwithstanding the inclemency of the weather, to a crowded audience. Rev. W. Probert, of Walmsley, conducted the devotional services in a way that reached the hearts of all his hearers, and Rev. W. Smith, of Rochdale, followed with an excellent discourse, of which we must give a brief abstract. The text was taken from 2 Cor. iii. 17, "Where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty." Having described what he conceived to be the liberty spoken of by the apostle, the preacher asked, "As a body of Christian believers, have we the spirit here referred to? As a Christian denomination, are we animated by this spirit, the spirit of Christ, or by that of fear? Do we exhibit the freedom which rejoices in its own liberty not more than in the liberty which is exercised towards opposite opinions?" The preacher then pointed out what intolerance was, and gently warned his hearers against falling into it in the estimate which they formed of some deviations from the views which they might individually entertain. Unitarians, he continued, ought to beware of making shipwreck of their consistency by cherishing the idea that their theological views realized all truth, actual or possible. Theology, as a science, was as susceptible of progress and expansion as chemistry or mechanics, or any other department of positive truth. After many judicious remarks about the temper to be cultivated by us in reference to our own religious inquiries as well as those of others, the preacher thus concluded: "Preserving, then, the attitude of humility, and moved by the desire to know and worship God with a larger faith in the fulness of his divine perfection, and contemplating with open eyes the glory of that perfection in the face of Jesus, his spirit will gradually inter-penetrate our whole sphere of thought and action, rend in twain the temple-veils of words, forms, creeds or systems, and give us access unto the Father, free ingress into the Holy of Holies. We shall have learnt to speak with other tongues than those culled from theological repertories; we shall value our peculiarities according to their power to promote piety and goodness, and thus, by rendering the religion of Christ the source of a more single-minded consecration, permit to the spirit of the Lord free course and fruitful operation."

At the conclusion of the religious services, the adjoining school-rooms were filled to overflowing by a numerous party, composed of the Monton families and friends from all parts of the district, who availed themselves of the hour allowed for tea to enjoy that social intercourse which these meetings are so admirably calculated to promote. The bouquets and festoons with which the principal apartment was so tastefully and profusely decorated, attracted general admiration. During this interval, we took the opportunity of walking into the burial-ground, where reposes the dust of many of the Nonconformist families of the neighbourhood. Then we strolled into the chapel, which, with its modern improvements, presents every convenience calculated to make

a place of worship what it ought to be. The semicircular tops to the windows have given the building more of an ecclesiastical character than it formerly possessed; while the recent introduction of a handsome and well-toned organ has greatly increased the effect of the services. It was admirably arranged that the company assembled for tea should retire into the chapel for a short space after that repast was over, during which time the power and tones of the new organ were skilfully exhibited by Mr. Wadsworth, Jun., and several anthems and hymns were sung with considerable effect by the choir. On a summons from the minister, the whole party returned to the upper school-room, when Rev. T. E. Poynting took the chair, not having been able to prevail on any of his lay friends to undertake the duties of that office. In opening the proceedings, he adverted to the circumstances which had brought us together, dwelt especially upon the social and religious objects of the meeting, and expressed his confidence that it would have a most beneficial influence on his own congregation. Mr. Probert and Mr. Smith severally acknowledged a vote of thanks to them for the part they had respectively taken in the public services of the day. Mr. Baker, on being called upon to speak in reference to the objects of the Association, gave a short account of its progress, and claimed for it the merit of having been instrumental, in various ways, in augmenting the usefulness and numbers of different congregations in the district. He then alluded to the present state of our Sunday-schools, which he described as not being, with few exceptions, in as efficient a state as they ought to be. One cause of this was the want of competent teachers, and he urged the consideration of this subject upon those who, possessing the ability, had not yet shewn the disposition, to assist in this confessedly important work.

Mr. Wright, of Bury, in speaking more specifically upon the subject of Sunday-schools and their kindred institutions, strengthened by his own opinion the remarks of the previous speaker. He also took the opportunity of throwing out some hints relative to the establishment of missionary stations in parts of the district favourable to the propagation of Unitarian opinions.

Mr. Frankland favoured the meeting with some observations on education—a real and effective education, free from the taint of sectarianism, and which should have a tendency to develop the faculties and give them a right direction.

Mr. Glover, of Bury, was called upon to propose the sentiment of Civil and Religious Liberty.

Other speakers, including H. Hollins, Esq., and Robert Heywood, Esq., also addressed the meeting. A deep interest was felt throughout the evening, and when the time arrived for bringing the business to a close, it was with manifest reluctance that many withdrew from the agreeable influences by which they had been surrounded. The Secretary announced, as the party was breaking up, that the next meeting of the Association would take place at Cockey Moor, on the last Thursday in April in the ensuing year, Rev. W. Probert being the preacher, and Rev. Mr. Gilbert, of Rivington, the supporter.

Bolton. F. B., Sec.

CHURCH MARRIAGE AFTER DISSENTING MARRIAGE.

The following Case and Opinion of counsel have been published. It should be added, in explanation of the Case and Opinion, that the statute referred to constitutes the solemnization of marriage "without due publication of banns," a felony.

Case.

On the 5th June, 1854, Francis Freeman and Sarah Ann Rogers were duly married under the provisions of 6 and 7 Wm. IV., c. 85, according to the rites and ceremonies of the Independents, in Odiham chapel, Hants, a chapel properly registered for marriages under the statutes. See certificate of marriage annexed.

The curate of the parish, although informed of the fact of such marriage, and aware of the parties having since the marriage been living together as man and wife, has lately advised them to be re-married according to the rites of the Established Church, and he or the other curate of the parish has, on the three last Sundays, published banns of marriage between the parties in the parish church of Grewell, the parish in which the parties now live.

In such banns the woman is named Sarah Ann Rogers, which was her maiden name. And it is understood that the curate is about to celebrate the marriage ceremony at the parish church on Sunday next, without fur-

ther publication of banns and without licence.

It is understood that the curate is quite aware of all the facts, and admits the legality of the former marriage, but is induced to the course he is about to take from the belief that, notwithstanding the statutes on the subject, the former marriage had been performed by an unauthorized party, such party not being clothed with apostolical succession.

You are requested to advise whether the above publication of banns be sufficient under the statute 4 Geo. IV., cap. 76, sec. 21, or any other statute.

And also whether the clergyman in question will be justified in performing the marriage ceremony under the circumstances, and whether, if he do so solemnize it, he will be liable to any and what legal penalties.

Opinion.

I conceive that there has been no "*due* publication of banns." Assuming that the absurdity of the intention of marrying husband and wife did not exist in the case, and that the proposed couple were single persons, about to marry by a wrong name of one of them, the marriage might be good or bad according to the intention of the parties. If there were no fraud in the parties named, the marriage might be good. But, however that might be, there would be no due publication of banns, and I think that there will equally be a want of due publication of banns, though the marriage is one which cannot be contracted.

And I think that the curate, knowing all the facts of the case, will, if he solemnize the marriage, come within the provisions of the 4 Geo. IV., cap. 76, sec. 21, and may be indicted under that section.

If the remedy under that section were to fail, he would no doubt be subject to ecclesiastical censure.

A. Sydney Aspland.

Temple, October, 1855.

We have not learnt whether the curate of Odiham, in the face of this Opinion, proceeded to solemnize the intended marriage at his church. Can any correspondent in the district give us information on this point?

UNITARIAN CHAPEL, CHICHESTER.

A meeting of the congregation assembling at the Unitarian chapel, Baffin's Lane, Chichester, was held on Thursday, Oct. 25th, at which R. H. Lacy, Esq., presided. The usual routine business having been transacted, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

That this meeting, mindful of the long and energetic pastoral services of the Rev. J. Fullagar, desires to record its high approbation of his able, eloquent and consistent advocacy of the Unitarian doctrine, and at the same time to offer him sincere expressions of its gratitude for his affectionate counsel and sympathy in hours of difficulty and distress.

This meeting deeply regrets its pecuniary inability to requite the Rev. gentleman's services in an adequate manner, especially as those services have, for the last seven years, been rendered under circumstances of great discouragement and unmerited misrepresentation.

This meeting, feeling also that impaired physical powers, consequent on accident and advanced years, require care and rest, respectfully submits its opinion, that it is desirable to suspend the evening service at Baffin's Lane chapel during the winter months; and, in conclusion, earnestly hopes that their esteemed and venerable Pastor may long be spared to aid still further the great work of his risen Master, the Lord Jesus Christ.

A copy of the above was forwarded the next day to Mr. Fullagar, by the Secretary, Mr Molesworth, who received the following reply:

My dear Sir,—I am much obliged to you for your very friendly note, enclosing me the resolution of the congregation of Baffin's-Lane chapel, and I beg, through you, to express to my friends comprising it my sincere thanks for the gratifying way in which they have expressed their feelings.

As to the discharge of ministerial duties, I fear I have done this imperfectly, though I can conscientiously say that I have ever felt deeply the responsibility of my office; and if at any time I have appeared to impress too earnestly on my friends attention to Christian duties, it has arisen solely from sincere affection and paramount regard to their eternal interests; and of course I can but regret, on their account, that with some it has not met with due appreciation, and, with what I had a just right to expect, an affectionate return.

I have ever felt deeply the importance of the Unitarian cause: it is with me the ark in which is enclosed the "pearl of great price." I look back with unalloyed pleasure on my varied attempts to defend

it; and though I may have expressed myself strongly, I have never felt the smallest unkindness towards any one on whose opinions I have animadverted.

It is with great reluctance that I concur in the suggestion of having the chapel closed during the evenings of the winter months; but I do feel myself quite unfit to conduct, in any satisfactory manner, an evening service.

But I hardly know whether I can concur in the wish, kindly expressed in the resolution, that my life may be prolonged; but be the remaining span longer or shorter, the kind attentions of my *staid* friends will cheer the evening of life, as they encourage me to hope that, when I shall be removed, my "memory will still be green in their souls."

Wishing them, my dear Sir, as well as yourself, health and comfort here, and the bliss of heaven hereafter, I remain, yours most truly,

JOHN FULLAGAR.

OLD MEETING-HOUSE, BIRMINGHAM.

The Rev. Charles Clarke has just begun a course of lectures at the Old meeting-house, Birmingham, on the following subjects and texts:

1. On God—Matt. vi. 9.
2. On Divine Goodness—Matt. vii. 11.
3. On Christ the Son of God—John xiv. 10.
4. On Christ as Redeemer and Saviour—John iii. 17.
5. On Repentance—Luke xviii. 10.
6. On the Christian Life—John xv. 16.
7. On Faith and Hope—Rom. viii. 24.
8. On Death—2 Cor. v. 1.
9. On the Future Life—John v. 25.

The lectures began on October 28th, and will go on regularly until the Sunday before Christmas.

AMERICAN HOSTILITY TO ENGLAND.

Our readers may like to know what are the sentiments of the better class of Americans towards our country. A leading article of the *Christian Inquirer* (the able Unitarian paper published at New York) of Oct. 6, thus introduces the subject:

"None of our readers need to be informed that at last Sebastopol, or rather its southern portion, is really taken. In referring to this fact, we cannot but recognize, not only a change in our own views, but in the public mind, since we published, several months ago, a rumour to this effect. Then the tidings were received with general exultation; now they are greeted, if not with general regret, certainly with very little of the enthusiasm which was then excited. Various causes have conspired to bring about this result, and some of them not creditable to us as Americans. The old jealousy of England, which has been inherited from our fathers, has had some influence. The mercantile spirit has made itself felt also; and the same is true of the pro-slavery interest. The latter, especially, is true to the instincts which not only make England odious because of her abolitionism, but which discern also close analogies between American slavery and Russian serfage."

While repudiating these feelings, the *Christian Inquirer* does not deny that the sympathies of America with ourselves and our allies have for some time been growing weaker and weaker. The chief cause which he alleges for the change is the character of our French ally, towards whom, notwithstanding his series of perjuries and cruelties, the English people and writers are charged with practising a "contemptible sycophancy." Our present alliance with the French nation ought not in justice to expose us to the charge of approving of the crimes by which Louis Napoleon ascended the throne. He is now the accepted monarch of our neighbours, and is on the whole governing them with a moderation and wisdom of which the early period of his power gave little promise. Not only to ourselves, but to the peace and civilization of the world, is it important that amicable relations should exist between France and England. Not less important, however, is the continuance of a cordial friendship between ourselves and the great Republic, and we earnestly implore our American brethren to look at the subject calmly and in all its bearings. Whatever objections they can allege against the Emperor, our ally, exist, and with tenfold force, in the despotic power against which we are now struggling. In France, there is no organized system of hostility and aggression dangerous to the peace and liberties of the world. In Russia, the system exists, and in such force as to overrule the personal bias of the monarch. We cannot admire the justice or impartiality of that morality which denounces Louis Napoleon, and sees little to disapprove or dread in monarchs like Nicholas and Constantine. Can it be that the flatteries and more substantial baits with which Russian diplomacy so skilfully deals, have swayed men in America who conceive themselves insensible to such influences?

REV. FRANKLIN HOWORTH.

A correspondent has sent us the following cutting from a Bury (Lancashire) newspaper, published in November :

"*Public Baptism.*—The fact having become generally known that the Rev. F. Howorth, of this town, had expressed a desire to be publicly immersed or baptized, and that the rite or ceremony was to be performed on Monday evening last, a large concourse of people assembled at the Knowlesley-Street Baptist chapel, to witness this religious rite, many persons being unable to gain admittance. The audience was composed of all sects of the Christian church. Several ministers belonging to the Baptist denomination were upon the platform. After singing and prayer and the reading of Scriptures, an address was delivered by Mr. Ashworth, minister of the place. The Rev. F. Howorth then delivered a discourse, which was listened to with breathless attention, in which he laid down his reasons why he had come to the determination of being baptized. With all due deference to his parents and friends who had given him his religious education, he did not consider that he ever had been baptized, inasmuch as he had never been baptized by his own will and by his own sect. He believed that what he was about to do was only what Jesus Christ, his Lord, required. After the discourse, the Rev. J. Harvey, of Cheshire, formerly of Bury, delivered an address characterized by great warmth and earnestness, in which he expressed the pleasure he felt at having been called upon to perform the duty allotted to him by his dear brother, Mr. Howorth. The ceremony was then performed (Mr. Harvey officiating) in the presence of all the congregation. After the immersion, the Divine blessing was implored, and the proceedings terminated soon after nine o'clock."

OBITUARY.

March 22, at his residence, Chatham, Mr. Thomas Miles Taylor. He was the son of the late Rev. Thomas L. Taylor, of Billingshurst, and at his father's death was only about four years old. By the exertions of several friends he was admitted into the Orphan Working School, at that time in the City Road; to which valuable institution he ever expressed his deep sense of obligation. On leaving the school, he was apprenticed to a ladies' shoemaker, and followed that business all his days. Shortly after his apprenticeship expired, his master, with whom he continued to reside, was disabled by paralysis; and Mr. T. at once undertook to maintain him and his wife, and paid to them the same affectionate attention as if they had been his own parents. This generous care he continued till their death. The burthen was, however, more than he could well bear; and the difficulties in which he was involved, pressing upon a sensitive temperament, led again and again to mental affections which made it necessary to place him in an asylum. Each time he was, by the Divine blessing restored, and returned to his occupation with ever fresh hope and energy. He was ever ready to assist those who were in need, whether by pecuniary assistance or personal service. His death, which was sudden, was probably connected with the same constitutional tendencies which had led to his mental alienation.

He was a zealous Unitarian and General Baptist, and was a member successively of the General Baptist congregations in Coles Street, London, and at Chatham, under the pastoral care of the writer, who had long entertained for him the warmest personal regard. In public affairs he was very active, but his very opponents respected the perfect disinterestedness of his labours and his freedom from ill-will. In efforts for social improvement he was warmly interested, and was an energetic and useful member of the Mechanics' Institution; the Committee of which, on his decease, passed a resolution expressing their regret for his death, and their sense of the value of the services he had rendered them.

J. C. M.

Oct. 30, at his residence, Ardwick Hall, Manchester, aged 86, John Kennedy, Esq.

Mr. Kennedy was a man in several respects so remarkable, and so well known through a more than ordinarily wide circle of friends and acquaintance, that he should hardly be allowed to pass away from the midst of them without some little tribute, however brief and imperfect, to his memory.

Mr. Kennedy was born on the family estate of Knocknalling, in the stewartry of Kirkcudbright, on the 4th of July, 1769. Being one of a numerous and not affluent family, he had to look to his own exertions as the source of his future fortunes. With this view, he came to England at the early age of fifteen, and settled at Chowbent, in Lancashire; where, under the care of a valued friend, he acquired a practical knowledge of the machinery employed in the cotton manufacture, which was at that time receiving a sudden and great development by the recent inventions of Arkwright, Crompton and others.

His apprenticeship completed, he settled in Manchester, in the first instance as a machine-maker. In the then state of the cotton trade, it was quite natural that he should pass from the making of machinery for others to the making of it for himself. Accordingly, in conjunction with the late Mr. M'Connel, he became a cotton-spinner; and by his steady conduct and attention, aided by those of his partner, soon laid the foundation of a not inconsiderable fortune.

This fortune, so honourably acquired, he expended as liberally. There was not, as is too often the case with men whose occupation has been the making of money, a particle of vulgar ostentation, or a taint of anything low, mean or contracted in Mr. Kennedy's disposition. He assisted very generously, but very delicately, many amongst his friends who needed assistance to get on in the world, or who were less fortunate than himself in worldly circumstances; and there were cases, it is believed, scarcely known even to his own family, of which it might almost literally be said that his right hand scarcely knew what his left hand did. His hospitality was almost unbounded. His house was proverbially open at all times to all comers. His style of living was as unpretending as possible, but on a most liberal scale. He was ever ready to receive and entertain intelligent strangers, eager to obtain and ready to give information; and few things afforded him more pleasure than to see one or two friends drop in at his dinner-table, and pass the evening with him in social conversation.

The tone of his conversation was very simple and unaffected. He never pretended to a knowledge of subjects which he did not understand. His questions and replies constantly evinced that the disposition of his mind was to occupy itself in meditating upon useful or important topics. His narratives of little incidents in his own life were often very graphic; and his observations, always those of a thoughtful man, were not seldom weighty and pithy. With general literature he had little acquaintance, and made no pretensions to it. Poetry, he would say, he did not understand. It was, however, rather its language; for he had unquestionably within him the latent germ of a poetical temperament. His own course had given him an insight into various phases of human life; and though fond of getting at a fact, he was disposed not to rest on the bare fact, but to environ it with a little adornment of imagination. This gave a peculiar tone to his whole mind, and impressed upon it a strong character of freshness and originality.

His natural inclination, seconded by some requirements on the ground of health, made him fond of moving about. He thus saw a great deal of his own country. He travelled in general very leisurely, often availing himself of a friend's hospitality, and staying in the same place several days together. He had thus the opportunity of obtaining the most correct information; and a keen eye, a quick apprehension, and a tenacious memory, enabled him with this advantage to store up a large variety of curious observations. From these, the nature of his intellect led him to deduce broad conclusions, which had about them much of a character strictly philosophical. Wherever he went, a subject of especial interest to him was the social condition of the labouring portion of the people, justly considering that this was, after all, the true test of the civilization of a nation.

Having witnessed the progress of the cotton trade almost from its commencement, and watched it with great interest, he was the depository of more facts on that subject, perhaps, than any man of his time. Going beyond the bare facts, he had thought a good deal about their significance, and their bearing on the social changes which they had effected. Had he possessed the inclinations and habits of a practised writer, he might have produced a singularly interesting history of the manufacturing districts during his own time. But this power he wanted. All that he has left behind him in this way is contained in some noticeable papers, read from time to time before the Literary and Philosophical Society of Manchester. They have since been collected and reprinted for private distribution.

From the particular nature of his mind and his physical temperament, which inclined him rather to thoughtful speculation than to active exertion, he took little part in the great political, religious or social movements of his day. He had, indeed, not much faith in pushing on society beyond its own natural quiet pace; more distrust than was perhaps quite reasonable, of the good to be effected by extensive organizations and philanthropic systems. He was more inclined to let it evolve its own ameliorations out of its own felt wants and efforts to supply them; to trust to private benevolence exercised in its own proper sphere and on its own immediate neighbourhood, rather than to associated exertions. He would say, in illustration of his principle, that if you wanted to improve the dwelling of a Scotch peasant, for example, you must not do it by building him an English model cottage, for which his habits had not yet fitted him, but a better one of his own kind. To improvements in this way he was a great friend, and took much pleasure in working at them himself. All his opinions, however, though expressed with great moderation, were broad and liberal, and ever on the side of progress. He once said pithily enough, that an old man who wanted to stop and stand still may be pardoned, but a young one who would do the same was most probably either a knave or a fool.

Mr. Kennedy was not in the habit of giving much external expression to his inward feelings and emotions. He had undoubtedly, however, fine sensibilities and strong affections. The steadfastness of his friendships was a marked feature in his character. The friends of his youth were those of his later days. He was continually making new ones as he advanced in life—many of them not undistinguished men; and those which he made, he seldom, if ever, lost. From his earliest days, he always sought for the best society which circumstances at the time enabled him to command; and as he had great natural modesty, an entire absence of pretension, a thorough desire of self-improvement, and a genuine respect for superior talent and knowledge, he was readily admitted into the best; and the position which he once won for himself, he maintained ever after.

There are not many men, who have lived so strictly a private life, who have been more widely known, or will be more respectfully remembered.

Nov. 8, at Pisa, Thomas Jevons, Esq., of Liverpool.

Nov. 16, at Liverpool, in his 82nd year, Mr. Wm. Rowlinson, an old and much-respected member of the Unitarian congregation, Renshaw Street.

Nov. 20, at Birmingham, Mr. Robt. Edmonds, aged 23 years. From an early period of life he was connected with the Sunday-schools of the Old meeting. Latterly he had acted as their Secretary. His attention to his duties, and the suavity of his manners, in him the index of a good heart, won for him the confidence of his companions and the warm affection of his friends. His early and almost sudden death is deeply lamented.

MARRIAGES.

Oct. 27, at the Great meeting-house, Coventry, by Rev. Thomas Hunter, Miss Clack, daughter of Mr. Thomas Clack, to Mr. Henry Mabbatt, of Coventry.

Oct. 29, at the chapel of the Christian Brethren, Mossley, by Rev. R. Brook Aspland, M. A., of Dukinfield, Mr. John Lawton to Miss Mary Wrigley, both of Mossley. This being the first marriage celebrated in this place of worship, the officiating minister presented, in behalf of the trustees, a handsomely-bound quarto Bible to the bride, accompanying the gift with a few words of appropriate exhortation.

Nov. 8, at the Old chapel, St. Nicholas, Ipswich, by Rev. J. G. Teggin, of Mansfield, Carston Tauk Egeberg, Esq., of Christiana, Norway, to Annie, third daughter of Samuel Ridley, Esq., of Ipswich.

Nov. 11, at the Old chapel, Dukinfield, by Rev. E. Higginson, of Wakefield, Mr. James Bardsley to Miss Sarah Clubb, both of Hooley Hill.

Nov. 15, at the Old chapel, Dukinfield, by Rev. R. B. Aspland, M.A., Mr. Thomas Hague to Elizabeth Ann, daughter of Mr. Thomas Cheetham, of Stalybridge.

Nov. 22, at the High-Pavement chapel, Nottingham, by Rev. B. Carpenter, Mr. Thomas Hubbard to Miss Mary Ann Parker, both of Nottingham.

GENERAL INDEX.

A. on Locke's Writings and Philosophy, 731.
Acts, when written? 374.
Aikin's, Dr., letter to Rev. John Seddon, 365.
Alexander's siege of Troy, 617.
Aliquis's letter to Rev. F. Howorth, 185.
Almanac, Unitarian, for 1855, 122.
Althorpe, Col., prosecutes James Montgomery, 147.
American slavery, Mr. Estlin on, 471.
American hostility to England, 771.
American Unitarian Association, 457.
Amy and her Mother, 701.
Anne, Queen, character of, 13.
Architecture, ecclesiastical, essays on, 14, 31, 274, 345. Mr. Ruskin on, 69.
Armstrong's, Rev. G., funeral sermon for Mr. Estlin, 481, 700.
Arnold's, Rev. T. K., Theological Critic, 1.
Aspland's, Rev. R., protest against the Church-of-England service for 29th of May, 364.
Aspland's, A. S., Opinion on a marriage case, 770.
Astley, Rev. R., biographical notice of, 265.
Astro-theology, or the Religion of Astronomy, 314.
Atheism, thoughts on secular, 589, 666, 696, 735—tested in an argument, 667—definition of, 668. George Jacob Holyoake and Modern, 695.
Austin's, Mrs., selection from Sydney Smith's Letters, 499.
Authorized Version, revision of, 580.

B. on the Roman Governors of Syria, 623.
B. B. on the Restoration of Belief, 298.
Bache's, Rev. S., Lectures on Unitarian Christianity, 156, 213. Account of jubilee of Rev. J. A. James, 639.
Bache, Mrs., obituary of, 390.
Bailey, Mr. Edward, obituary of, 588.
Baker's, Miss, Glossary of Northamptonshire Words and Phrases, 118.
Banbury chapel, architecture of, 91.
Baptism, Dr. Wordsworth on, 10.
Bathurst, Bishop, 613.
Bayley, Mrs., obituary of, 196.
Bayley, Mr., obituary of, 581.
Belfast Unitarian Society, tracts issued by, 700.
Bentley's, T., Esq., letters to Rev. J. Seddon, 367, 370, 373.
Bible, discussion on the, 193. Higginson's Spirit of the, 418. Revision of Authorized version of, 580.
Birkenhead chapel, architecture of, 92.
Birmingham, meetings at, 762, 764. Lectures by Rev. C. Clarke at, 771.
Blundell, Rev. Stephen, obituary of, 652.
Bolton District Association, 384, 768.
Bowman, Mr. H., on ecclesiastical architecture, 14.
Bowman's, Prof., address on Sunday-schools, 323.
Bowring, Sir John, on Brahminism, 538, 545.
Bowring, Rev. T., on British Schools, 681.
Brahmins of Hindostan, reformed, 538. Advances in Brahminism, 545.
Brock's, Rev. G. B., sermon before Unitarian Association, 430, 701.
Brook-Street chapel, Manchester, architecture of, 86.
Brooke, Rev. T. R., on Persecutions in Switzerland and Germany, 699.
Brougham's, Lord, Speech on Religious Liberty Bill, 697.
Brown, Mr. Samuel, obituary of, 326.
Brown, Mr. J. C., obituary of, 652.
Bunsen's Hippolytus and his Age, 1, 525. Philosophy of History, 525.
Bury, architecture of chapel at, 91. Unitarianism at, 193. Revds. Franklin Howorth's and J. Wright's Letters to Unitarians at, 188.

C.'s review of Ruskin's Lectures on Architecture, 69.
C.'s, C., obituary of Chas. Gifford, Esq., 326—of Mr. Henry Taylor, 328.
C.'s, T., obituary of Miss Woolnough, 389.
Cabmen's Strike, Rev. John Gordon's Lecture on the, 121.
Cambridge, Reminiscences of, 563.
Canterbury's, Archbishop of, Church-rate Bill, 386.
Carbery, Earl of, friend of Jeremy Taylor, 111.

Carlyle's Cromwell, extracts from, 417, 546, 562, 643.
Carmarthen College, 523.
Carpenter's, Rev. R. L., sermon before Provincial Assembly, 445—speech at, 452. Letter on death of Mr. Estlin, 477.
Channing's, Dr., sermon on War preached by Sydney Smith, 516. German Translation of the Works of, 741.
Channing's, Rev. W. H., sermons at Huddersfield, 125. Speech at Provincial Assembly, 448.
Chantrey, interview of Dalton with, 35.
Chichester, Unitarian chapel at, 770.
Christ, sacrifice of, 273—the revealed pattern to man, 383. Remarks on the Divinity of, 701.
Christening in Russia, 46.
Christian Cabinet, extract from, 651.
Christian Festivals, 306.
Christian Tract Society, 436.
Church, the, as an interpreter of Scripture, 10.
Church of England—service for 29th of May of, 364. Sermon on Dangers to the, 576.
Church rates—Bills in reference to, 385. Petition of Leeds congregation on, 386—of Provincial Assembly, 450.
Clarke, Rev. J. F., on advantages of being a small denomination, 55—on Unitarians an honest denomination, 117.
Clarke's, Rev. C., lecture to the Secularists, 428. Lectures at Birmingham, 771.
Clay's, Sir W., Church-rate Bill, 385.
Cleator services, 650.
Clement of Rome, Epistle of, to the Corinthians, 743.
Cogan, Rev. E., obituary of, 196. Memoir of, 237.
Cogan, Dr. Thos., Unitarianism of, 211.
Collet's, Miss, Biography of G. J. Holyoake, 695.
Colour-blindness, 34, 46.
Coleridge, anecdote of, 569.
Cooke, John, Esq., obituary of, 390.
Cooper, Miss, obituary of, 132.
Creation, Essay on Philosophy of, 403.
Crimea, a Week in the, 701.
Crucifixion, on the date of the, 620.

D.'s account of examination at Carmarthen College, 523—of South Wales Unitarian Tract Society, 524.
Daisy, the, 611.
Dalton, John, review of Memoirs of, 27.
Darbishire, Mr. H. A., on ecclesiastical architecture, 274.
Daventry academy, Rev. E. Cogan at, 240.
Davy, Sir H., 33.
Dean, Henry, minister at Padiham, on the death of, 184.
Death, Angel of, 349.
Denomination, advantages in being a small, 55. Unitarians an honest, 175.
Die, is it painful to, 236.
Domville, Sir W., on the Sabbath, 570.
Duels and Duelling, Notes on, 383.
Dukinfield chapel, architecture of, 87.
Dunn, Mr., and the British and Foreign School Society, 651, 727. Pamphlet by, 758.

Eastern Unitarian Christian Society, 441.
Edinburgh Review, started by Sydney Smith and others, 508. Extract from, on Church and Dissenting schools, 684.
Edmonds, Mr. Robert, obituary of, 774.
Education, national, 302. Mr. Wrigley's Letters on, 574.
Elwall, Edward, some account of, and his writings, 329.
Estlin, J. B., Esq., obituary of, 459. Memoir of, 461. Rev. G. Armstrong's funeral sermon for, 481, 700.
Evangelical movement in England, 202.
"Evangelical" poetry and theology, specimen of, 651.
Evelyn, a friend of Jeremy Taylor, 112.
Everett's Memoirs of James Montgomery, 133, 752.

Federal-Street (Boston, U.S.) church case, 644, 702.
Fellows, Mr. R., obituary of, 581.
Fogg, Miss Sarah, obituary of, 327.
Forster's, Rev. William, Free Christian Church, opening of, 579. Sermon before Southern Unitarian Society, 711.
Frend, Mr. Wm., proceedings against, 569.
Fullagar, Rev. J., resolution in reference to, 770.
Furst, Mrs., obituary of, 328.

G.'s review of the Life of Jay, 197.
G., W., on the death of Henry Dean, minister at Padiham, 184.
Gaskell's, Rev. W., address to the students of the Unitarian Home Missionary Board, 47. Speech at Provincial Assembly, 447. Sermon before Unitarian Association, 578—before Western Unitarian Society, 700.
Gaskell, Mrs., obituary of, 392.
Gee-Cross chapel, Hyde, architecture of, 88.
Gell's, Rev. J. P., letter on the Trinitarianism of the Rev. Michael Maurice, 521. Rev. E. Kell's reply, 560.
Gibson's, Mr. Milner, Education Bill, 303.
Gifford, Charles, Esq., obituary of, 326.
Glaucus, by Charles Kingsley, 685.

Gordon's, Rev. John, Lecture on the Sabbath Question and the Cabmen's Strike, 121—to the Secularists, 428.
Gospels, Mr. Higginson on the, 423.
Grant's, Rev. Brewin, discussion with Mr. Holyoake, 428, 599.
Greek New Testament, criticism of, 169.
Green's, Rev. H., Remarks on Texts on the Divinity of Christ, 701.
Griffiths', Mr., letters to Rev. J. Seddon, 371.
Griffiths, Mrs., obituary of, 581.
Grundy, Mrs., obituary of, 388.
Gunning's Reminiscences of Cambridge, 563.
Guthrie, Dr., on Ragged Schools, 576.

Halifax, discussion on the Bible at, 193.
Ham, Mr. Panton, and his reviewer, 56.
Hardy, Thos., hymn on acquittal of, 143.
Hawkes, Rev. H., on monument to John Pounds, 376.
Heavenly Witnesses, the three, 751.
Heber's, Bishop, Life of Jeremy Taylor, 98.
Henry's, Dr., Memoirs of Dalton, 27.
Heywood, Oliver, inscription in memory of, 271.
Heywood, James, Esq., and Dr. Von Bohlen's work on the Pentateuch, 717. Speech of, on University Reform, 764.
Higginson's, Rev. E., letter on the Ministers' Benevolent Society, 63. Astro-theology, 314. Sermon on death of the Emperor of Russia, 316—before Southern Unitarian Fund Society, 318, 700. Spirit of the Bible, 418.
Hill, Rowland, testimonial to, originated by Mr. Estlin, 472.
Hindostan, reformed Brahmins of, 538.
Hippolytus and his Age, 1, 525.
History, Bunsen's Philosophy of, 525.
Holland's, John, Memoirs of Jas. Montgomery, 133, 752.
Holland's, Rev. P., letters to Rev. John Seddon, 365, 366.
Holland, Rev. T. C., on Luke's Gospel and the Acts, 374.
Holland's, Lady, Memoir of Sydney Smith, 499.
Holyoake, Mr. G. J., the Secularist, 128, 596, 669. His reply to Unitarian lectures, 428. Modern Atheism and, 695.
Hone, Mrs. Abigail, obituary of, 325.
Hope-Street church, Liverpool, architecture of, 90.
Howorth, Rev. F.—letter of Aliquis to, 185. Letter to Unitarians at Bury by, 188. Rev. J. Wright's Letter on conversion to Trinitarianism of, 188. Our critic in the Inquirer on, 259. And his critics, 261. Letter of Quis on, 262. Baptism of, 772.
Howorth, Mr. Benj., obituary of, 652.
Huddersfield Unitarian church, opening of, 59, 125. Architecture of, 92. Rev. Jas. Martineau's sermon at, 60, 381. Theological illiberality at, 712.
Hunter, Rev. Joseph, Montgomery's tribute to, 756.
Hutton's, Dr., letter to Mr. Richard Cogan, 249.
Hutton's, Rev. J. H., sermon, What is Christianity? 700.

Inductive Philosophy, Essay on, 393.
In memoriam F. E. E., 264.
Inquirer, our critic in the, 259.
Iris, the, Montgomery starts, 142—resigns editorship of, 757.
Irish Non-subscribing Presbyterian Association, Rev. C. Porter's sermon before, 120.
Irving, Edward, Biography of, 192.

J.'s, W. D., review of Northamptonshire Words and Phrases, 118.
James, Rev. J. A., edits Life of Jay, 197. Jubilee of, 639.
James, Rev. W., delivers address at the funeral of Mr. Estlin, 481.
Jashar, book of, 350.
Jay, Rev. William, Life of, 197.
Jeffery, Francis, Esq., letter of Sydney Smith to, 509.
Jesus, Scenes from the Life of, 690.
Jewish Youth, Guide to Instruction of, 573.
Jevons, Thomas, Esq., obituary of, 774.
1 John v. 7, Wordsworth and Bunsen on, 7.
Judaism, Lectures on, 571.
Judd, Rev. Sylvester, Life of, 176, 225.

K. on Dr. Bunsen and his critics, 1. On Bunsen's Philosophy of History, 525.
K.'s, E., obituary of John Cooke, Esq., 390. Account of Southern Unitarian Society, 711.
K.'s, I. S., obituary of Mrs. Gaskell, 392.
Kell, Rev. E., sermon of, at Huddersfield, 126—on Peace, 316. Memoir of the late Rev. Michael Maurice, 407. Sir J. Bowring's letter to, 545. Letter, in reply to Rev. J. P. Gell, on Rev. Michael Maurice, 560.
Kenilworth chapel, architecture of, 88.
Kennedy, John, Esq., obituary of, 772.
Kenrick's, Rev. J., estimate of the scholarship of Rev. E. Cogan, 251. Address at close of Theological examination at Manchester New College, 481. Work on Phœnicia, 547, 614.
Kenrick, Samuel, Esq., obituary of, 64.
Kingsley's, Rev. C., Glaucus, 685.

Language, on the study of, 48. Dr. Bunsen on Egyptian, 531. Mr. Kenrick on Phœnician, 614.
Layhe, Rev. John, obituary of, 581.
Layman, a, on Mr. Howorth and his critics, 261.
Lees, Miss, obituary of, 588.
Leigh, Mr. Peter, obituary of, 66.
"Let our Light shine"—on ecclesiastical architecture, 345.
Little Walter, 690.
Liturgy for the Use of a Unitarian Church, 192.
Livermore's Commentary on Epistle to the Romans, 378
Liverpool Liturgy, 369.
Locke, John, letter of, 360. Writings and Philosophy of, 731.
Lowe, Mrs., obituary of, 652.
Luke's Gospel, when written? 374.

M.'s, J. C., obituary of Mr. T. M. Taylor, 772.
M.'s, T. L., obituary of R. J. P. Wright, Esq., 586.
Madge's, Rev. T., lecture to the Secularists, 385, 428. Speech at Unitarian Association on Dr. Priestley, 434.
Mahon's History of England, extract from, 13.
Manchester New College, annual meeting of, 123. Rev. E. Cogan invited to, 243. Annual examination of, 445, 522. Address of Rev. J. Kenrick at, 481—of Rev. G. V. Smith, 653.
Manchester District Sunday-school Association, 319.
Marler, Mr. Benjamin, obituary of, 652.
Marriage Bill, History of Dissenters', 696.
Marriage ceremony, assistance at the, 751.
Marriage, Church, after Dissenting, 769.
Marriages, 328, 392, 460, 588, 652, 716, 774.
Marshall's, Rev. T. L., lecture to the Secularists, 428.
Martineau's, Rev. J., sermon at Huddersfield, 60, 125, 381. Speech at Provincial Assembly, 449.
Martineau, Miss, and the Westminster Review, 56.
Mathews, Hannah, obituary of, 652.
Maud, by Tennyson, 602.
Maurice, Rev. Michael, obituary of, 389. Memoir of, 407. Religious opinions of, 412. Rev. J. P. Gell's letter on, 521. Rev. E. Kell in reply, 560.
M'Connel, Frederic, Esq., obituary of all the children of, 196.
Middle ages, emblem and monument of the, 80.
Midland Unitarian Association, 436.
Mill-Hill chapel, Leeds, architecture of, 89. Petition of the congregation on church rates, 386. Tea-party at, 714.
Mind and Matter, question of, argued, 736.
Ministerial appointments and changes during 1854, 126.
Ministers' Benevolent Society, 63.
Miracles, Mr. Higginson on, 420.
Montgomery, James, Memoirs of, 133, 752. His career as a poet, 149. Religious opinions of, 151, 755.
Montgomery's Illustrations of the Law of Kindness, 317.
Moravian chicks, 305.
Music, Mr. New's Selection of, 317.

Naylor, Mrs., obituary of, 652.
National Review, 699.
Needham, Miss C. G., obituary of, 652.
New's Selection of Sacred Music, 317.
New-England schools, 178.
New Testament, on the canon of, in the days of Hyppolytus, 4. Criticism of the Greek, 169. Mr. Sharpe's Notes on, 294. Mr. Higginson on, 418.
Newcastle-on-Tyne chapel, architecture of, 92.
Newton, Rev. John, sketch of, 206.
"Nip it in the Bud," on the marriage ceremony, 751.
Northamptonshire Words and Phrases, Miss Baker's Glossary of, 118.

Old Testament, Mr. Ryland on a new version of the, 57. Mr. Sharpe's Notes on, 294.
Organford, new Unitarian chapel at, 128.

P.'s, A. L., lines in memoriam F. E. E., 264.
Ψ. on Mr. Higginson's Spirit of the Bible, 418.
Pakington's, Sir J., Education Bill, 302.
Patience, lines on, 359.
Patriotic Lord of the Bedchamber, 559.
Paul's cross, 546.
Peace, Rev. E. Kell's sermon on, 316.
Pentateuch, age and origin of the, 717.
Phantom-dispersers, 643.
Philippsohn's Lectures on Judaism, 571.
Phœnicia, Rev. J. Kenrick's work on, 547, 614.
Pillsbury's Mr. Parker, letter to Mr. Estlin, 479.
Porter's, Rev. Classon, sermon before Irish Non-subscribing Presbyterian Association, 120.
Potter, Mr. Henry, obituary of, 65.
Pounds, John, monument to, 194, 375.
Powell's, Rev. Baden, Essays on Inductive Philosophy, Unity of Worlds, and Philosophy of Creation, 393.
Powis, Dr., sermon on consecration to a bishopric of, 576.

Prayer, Mr. Estlin's letter on, 467.
Priestley, Dr., on Edward Elwall, 329. Rev. T. Madge's speech at Unitarian Association on, 434. Guest of Mr. Estlin, 461.
Provincial Assembly, 387, 444. Rev. R. L. Carpenter's sermon before, 445, 488.
Psychological Inquiries, extract from, 236.
Pump and the cross, 262.

Quaker, roasted, Sydney Smith's story of a, 501.
Quarterly Review, extract from, on Servetus, 557.
Quis on the pump and the cross, 262.

R's, J., review of Memoirs of Dalton, 27.
Ragged Schools, lecture on, 576.
Raisbeck, Mr. Michael, obituary of, 389.
Rammohun Roy, Unitarianism of, disputed, 209. Attended by Mr. Estlin, 469.
Reasoner, the Secularist organ, 385. Report of Unitarian lectures in, 428. Referred to in Thoughts on Secular Atheism, 596, 666.
Redford, Dr., edits Life of Jay, 197.
Reggio's Guide to Instruction of Jewish Youth, 573.
Religion, natural and revealed, and inductive philosophy, 393.
Religious Liberty Bill, 697.
Restoration of Belief, 298.
Ridge, Miss, obituary of, 389—correction of, 460.
Robberds', Rev. J. G., Discourses, 306.
Robertson, Rev. F. W., on the sacrifice of Christ, 273.
Robinson, Robert, anecdotes of, 570.
Rodick, Thomas, Esq., obituary of, 459.
Roman Governors of Syria, 623.
Romans, Commentary on the Epistle to, 378.
Rowlinson, Mr. W., obituary of, 774.
Royal Society, contributions of Dalton to, 36.
Russell's, Lord John, Education Bill, 302.
Ruskin on Architecture, 69.
Russia, Emperor of, sermons on death of, 316.
Russia, Englishwoman in, extract from, 46.
Rutt, Mrs., obituary of, 588.
Ryland, Rev. J. H., on a new version of the Old Testament, 57.
Ryland, Rev. John, sketch of, 207.

S. S. on the date of the crucifixion, 620.
Sabbath, Rev. J. Gordon on the, 121. Sir W. Domville's work on the, 570.
Sabine's Notes on Duels and Duelling, 383.
School Society, British and Foreign, 651. Religious instruction unsectarian in schools connected with, in 1816, 681. Mr. Dunn's pamphlet on the Unitarians and, 758. Meeting at Birmingham on perversion of the, 762—remarks on, 727.
Schools, Church and Dissenting, 684.
Secularists—notice of Unitarian services, 128. Mr. Madge's lecture to, 385. Lectures by Unitarians to, and Mr. Holyoake's reply, 428. Thoughts on the so-called Secularism of the present day, 589, 666.
Seddon, Rev. J., letters and papers of, 365.
Servetus and the discovery of the circulation of the blood, 557.
Sharpe's, Mr., Notes on the Old and New Testament, 274.
Sheffield Register, James Montgomery's connection with, 139.
Shelley not an Atheist, 675.
Shoobridge, T. B., Esq., obituary of, 459. Funeral sermon for, 700.
Silver, Mr. T. T., obituary of, 652, 714.
Slaughter, Mr. Samuel, obituary of, 581.
Smith's, Sir J. E., letter on botany, 65.
Smith, Mrs., obituary of, 392.
Smith, Sydney, Memoir of, 499. On Bishop Bathurst, 613. Quoted by Mr. James Heywood, on Universities, 764.
Smith, Mr. R., obituary of, 652.
Smith's, Rev. G. V., address at opening of the session of Manchester New College, 653.
Solly's, Rev. H., lecture to the Secularists, 428.
South Wales Unitarian Tract Society, 524.
Southcote, Joanna, account of, 567.
Southern Unitarian Fund Society, annual meeting of, 318. Rev. E. Higginson's sermon before, 318, 700.
Southern Unitarian Society, 711.
Stanger, Mr., obituary of, 388.
Stanley's, Rev. A. T., Lecture on Modern History, extract from, 80.
Stanley, Lord, Letters to, on Education, 574.
Steane, Dr., on Persecutions in Switzerland and Germany, 699.
Stevens, Rev. William, obituary of, 326.
Stockport Unitarian church, architecture of, 87.
Stogdon, A., Esq., obituary of, 326.
Stourbridge Sunday-schools, 580.
Strickland's Queens of England, extract from, 559.
Sunday-School Association, 435.
Sunday-School Penny Magazine, 122.
Sunday-schools, statistics of, 320, 435. Mr. Bowman's address on, 323. Anniversary of, at Stourbridge, 580.

Superstition, Mr. Bache on, 219.
Swansea chapel, architecture of, 88.
Switzerland, Persecutions in, 699.
Syria, Governors of, at the birth of Christ, 623.

T.'s, J. J., obituary of John Hutton Tayler, Esq., 66.
T.'s, T. F., obituary of Mrs. Hone, 325 —of Mr. T. T. Silver, 714.
Tagart, Rev. E., on Locke's Writings and Philosophy, 731.
Talbot's, Rev. E., sermon on death of T. B. Shoobridge, Esq., 700.
Tayler, John Hutton, obituary of, 66.
Tayler's, Rev. J. J., lecture to the Secularists, 428.
Taylor, Mr. Henry, obituary of, 328.
Taylor, Jeremy, review of the Works of, 98.
Taylor, Mr. T. M., obituary of, 772.
Tennyson's Maud, 602.
Terrell's History of Dissenters' Marriage Bill, 698.
Thoughts to Help and Cheer, 317.
Tibnam, Miss Mary, obituary of, 652.
Tolerance and ascendancy, 562.
Tract Societies, 436, 438, 524, 580.
Tregelles, Dr., on the Greek New Testament, 169.
Trinity Sunday, reflections suitable to, 377.
Truth and mercy, 417.
Tucker, Miss, obituary of, 392.
Tyre, siege of, 617.

Unitarian Association, British and Foreign, anniversary of, 430. Sermon before, by Rev. G. B. Brock, 430, 701 —by Rev. W. Gaskell, 578.
Unitarian Home Missionary Board, Rev. W. Gaskell's address to the students of, 47. Sketch of the origin of, 58.
Unitarian Believer on the Three Heavenly Witnesses, 751.
Unitarian church, architecture adapted to the, 14, 31, 274, 345.
Unitarians an honest denomination, 117.
Unitarianism, Dr. Bunsen on, 12. Mr. Bache's Lectures on, 156. At Bury, Lancashire, 193. Sylvester Judd on, 229. And Secularism, 428.
United States, Unitarian societies in, 64.
Universities, Sydney Smith's aversion to, 507, 764. Mr. Gunning on the morality of, 564.
University Reform, meeting at Birmingham on, 764.

Vaccination, Mr. Estlin on, 470.
Venice, Mr. Ruskin on the Stones of, 69.
Villiers', Rev. H. M., sermon on Dangers to the Church of England, 576.
Von Bohlen's, Dr., Introduction to Genesis, 717.

W.'s lines on the Angel of Death, 349— on Patience, 359.
W.'s, C., obituary of Mrs. Worthington, 129.
W.'s, W., obituary of Henry Wansey, Esq., 328.
Wansey, Henry, Esq., obituary of, 328.
Warrington academy, 368.
Warwickshire Unitarian Tract Society, 580.
Webb's Unitarian Almanac, 122.
Wellington, Duke of, Ode on, 603.
Wesley's Life, extract from, 305.
Westminster Review and Miss Martineau, 56.
West-Riding Tract Society, 438.
Whately's Detached Thoughts and Apothegms, extract from, 166.
Whitfield's, Rev. E., Amy and her Mother, 701.
Wilks', Washington, Biography of Edward Irving, 192.
Woman's Rights, 227.
Woods', Rev. J. C., sermon on the Fast Day, 316.
Woolnough, Miss, obituary of, 389.
Wordsworth, Dr., on St. Hippolytus and the Church of Rome, 1.
Worlds, Essay on the Unity or Plurality of, 399.
Worship congenial to man's higher nature, 381.
Worthington, Mrs., obituary of, 129.
Wrigley's, Mr., Letters on Education, 574.
Wright's, Rev. John, Letter on the conversion to Trinitarianism of Rev. F. Howorth, 188. Sermon before Manchester District Sunday-School Association, 319.
Wright, Robt. J. P., Esq., obituary of, 586.

Y.'s, J., review of Sir W. Domville's work on the Sabbath, 570.
Yarmouth chapel, architecture of, 88.

Zumpt on the Roman Governors of Syria, 623. Prefatory notice to Works of Channing by, 741.

HR. 13. ott

C. Green, Printer, Hackney.

HIBBERT TRUST.

SECOND REPORT OF THE TRUSTEES.

27TH JUNE, 1855.

THE Trustees having, in their first Report, issued in June 1854, stated fully the nature and objects of the Trust founded by the late Mr. Hibbert, the various measures taken by them, and by their Committee of Management, to organise the machinery of the Trust, and to bring it into full action, have now the pleasure of stating in this, their second Report, that those measures are in operation, and of expressing their hope that the liberal objects contemplated by the Founder, and fully stated in the Trust Deed, will prove efficient, under the careful superintendence of his Trustees, in realising the intended design, and of contributing to bring into the office of the sacred ministry among persons professing anti-Trinitarian opinions, a number of enlightened, earnest, and able men, who will not only do honour to the cause which they espouse, but to that of full and free inquiry on all subjects connected with the highest mental, moral, and religious interests of mankind.

Although, as was to be expected, some difficulties occurred in the commencement of their labours, these difficulties have

not only been so far overcome, but they trust such means have been adopted, as will effectually guard against their future recurrence.

The first difficulty was one to be expected in the early years of the Trust, viz. the want of a sufficient number of duly-qualified Candidates. One only, with the necessary antecedent qualifications, offered himself for the first Examination; the Committee having, from a due regard to the rules and regulations laid down for their guidance, as well as from a desire fully to maintain the standard of required proficiency, felt themselves obliged to decline to admit as a Candidate a gentleman possessed in many respects of highly suitable qualifications, but who thought it right to refuse to submit to those tests of Examination and that competition which the Trustees have considered essential to the true interests of the Trust.

In the first Report it was mentioned that a body of Examiners had been engaged for the important purpose of giving their advice and guidance as to the proper subjects of Examination, and who would be able to give such an opinion of the merits of the Candidates as would govern the proceedings of the Trustees. Since the time of the first Examination, Mr. J. C. A. Scott, in consequence of having himself become a Student of Manchester New College, has, from reasons of delicacy, resigned the office of Examiner on behalf of this Trust, in which he might have been called upon to examine some of his fellow-students in Manchester New College, who might be Candidates for admission upon this foundation. The Committee have been fortunate enough to supply the place thus vacated by the acceptance of the same by W. A. Case, Esq., M.A., of the University of London, and Fellow of University College, who has undertaken the duties of Examiner in the subjects entrusted to Mr. Scott.

During the year some objections have been made to the

language and supposed spirit of some of the Rules and Regulations of the Trust; and a Special Memorial on the subject was sent in by the Students of Manchester New College, supported by the Principal of the College. This Memorial was duly considered, and a conference held between the Committee and the Principal on the subject, when the Committee agreed to recommend some verbal alterations for the consideration of the Trustees. These alterations have been subsequently adopted by the Trustees, and, it is believed, will obviate such objections as those alluded to.

The time specified for Candidates to send in applications does not expire till the 1st of October. Two applications have already been made.

The next Examination for Scholarships has been fixed for the 19th, 20th, and 21st November, and it has been publicly announced that three Scholarships will be awarded, provided the Candidates are declared to be duly qualified by the Examiners.

D. DAVISON,
SECRETARY.

UNIVERSITY HALL,
Gordon Square, London.